

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

JAMES EUSTACE SHAW

## CONTENTS

PLATH, O. E.—Schiller's Influence on 'Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre,'	257
ALDEN, RAYMOND M.—The 1710 and 1714 Texts of Shakespeare's Poems,	268
KURRELMEYER, W.—Die Doppeldrucke der zweiten Cottaschen Ausgabe von Goethe's Werken,	275
PORTER, CHARLOTTE.—How Shakespeare Set and Struck the Scene for 'Julius Caesar' in 1599,	281
CHEW, SAMUEL C.—Did Byron write 'A Farrago Libelli,'	287
ZDANOWICZ, CASIMIR.—Frosine's Marquise in 'L'Avare,'	291

### Reviews:—

TOBIAS DIEKHOF, The German Language. Outlines of its Development. [Robert H. Fife, Jr.]	293
FRANCIS C. LOCKWOOD, The Freshman and His College.	
MAURICE G. FULTON, College Life: Its Conditions and Problems.	
RICHARD RICE, JR., The College and the Future. [John C. French.]	297
GEORGE T. FLOM, The Phonology of the Dialect of Aurland, Norway. [A. Le Roy Andrews.]	299
ERNST FEISE, Die Leiden des jungen Werthers, von J. W. Goethe. [Max F. Blau.]	301

### Correspondence:—

SEIBERT, HARRIET.—Chaucer and Horace,	304
MOORE, JOHN R.—Sources of <i>In Memoriam</i> in Tennyson's Early Poems,	307
JENSEN, GERARD E.—An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews, 1741,	310
KOLBE, P. R.—Notes on Göttingen and the <i>Harzreise</i> ,	311
COOPER, C. B.—But Me No Buts,	314
COOK, ALBERT S.—Chaucer's <i>fraknes</i> ,	315
CLARK, A. F. BRUCE.—A Dialogue by Boileau,	315

### Brief Mention:—

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE, Chaucer and his Poetry;—W. W. GREG, <i>The Assumption of the Virgin: A Miracle Play from the N-Town Cycle</i> ;—MALCOLM WILLIAM WALLACE, <i>The Life of Sir Philip Sidney</i> ;—CARL A. KRAUSE, <i>Über die Reformmethode in Amerika</i> ,	316
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Thirty-Five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION (with inter-  
mission from July to October inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume  
is \$2.00 for the United States and Mexico; \$2.25  
for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to Murray P. Brush; and for the Italian and Spanish Departments to J. E. Shaw. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays, and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.



## OXFORD GERMAN SERIES

BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS

General Editor: JULIUS GOEBEL, Ph. D.



### *New and Recent Volumes*

**Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen.** By Grillparzer. Edited, with Notes and a Study of Grillparzer's life and works, by John L. Kind. Inhaltsangaben, Fragen, Rückblicke und Themen by C. M. Purin and John L. Kind. *Crown 8vo*, pp. cxxxv + 208. With 4 Illustrations.....70c.

"Such an edition is a genuine contribution to the collection of texts that every German teacher must prize."—Prof. ALICE P. STEVENS, Mt. Holyoke College.

**A Scientific German Reader.** Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by Herbert Z. Kip. *Crown 8vo*, pp. xii + 445. 31 Figures....\$1.25

This Reader is designed not merely to furnish a certain amount of reading material along scientific lines but rather to give selections which may afford glimpses into unexplored fields. The translation of scientific works requires careful study and great accuracy. With this in mind Professor Kip has prepared notes that are more than ordinarily rich in information and in helpful discussion.

**Schuld and Other Stories.** By Ilse Leskien. Edited, with Notes, Vocabulary, Exercises, and an Appendix containing Helps to Translation, by Bayard Quincy Morgan. *Crown 8vo*, pp. iv + 154.....40c.

"The stories are delightfully refreshing and should be appreciated by learners and teacher. The carefully prepared appendix should interest the student of translation."—Prof. Catherine M. Cox, College of the Pacific.

*Others in preparation.*

*Send for complete catalogue.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH

35 West 32nd Street, New York

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXI

MAY, 1916

NUMBER 5

## SCHILLER'S INFLUENCE ON WILHELM MEISTERS LEHRJAHRE

In Goethe's *Tag- und Jahreshefte* for the year 1795 we find the following entry in regard to his *Wilhelm Meister*:<sup>1</sup> "Schiller's Theilnahme nenne ich zuletzt, sie war die innigste und höchste;" and a year later he writes to Schiller in the same connection:<sup>2</sup> "Wenn dieses nach Ihrem Sinne ist, so werden Sie auch Ihren eigenen Einfluss darauf nicht verkennen, denn gewiss ohne unser Verhältniß hätte ich das Ganze kaum, wenigstens nicht auf diese Weise, zu stande bringen können."

Goethe scholars have investigated this influence,<sup>3</sup> but none of them have treated the subject exhaustively. What is more, recently found material, such as the *Theatralische Sendung*, renders untenable many former conclusions and it seems, therefore, that the subject needs further investigation.

Goethe published his novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* in four volumes of which the first three appeared in 1795 and the last in

<sup>1</sup> *Goethes Werke*, Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Herzogin Sophie von Sachsen, Weimar, 1892 (hereafter referred to as *Werke*), xxxv, 50.

<sup>2</sup> *Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe*, Mit Einleitung von Franz Munker, Stuttgart und Berlin, (hereafter referred to as *Briefwechsel*) i, 198.

<sup>3</sup> 1. Düntzer a) *Erläuterungen zu den deutschen Klassikern*, Erste Abtheilung: Erläuterungen zu Goethes Werken, 3 Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre Leipzig, 1875 (hereafter referred to as *Erläuterungen*). b) *Deutsche National-Litteratur*, Herausgegeben von Joseph Kürschner 96. Band, Erste Abteilung, Goethes Werke 15, 1 and, Zweite Abteilung, Goethes Werke 15, 2 (hereafter referred to as *Kürschner*). 2. Gräff, *Goethe Ueber Seine Dichtungen*, Erster Teil, Die Epischen Dichtungen, Zweiter Band, Frankfurt a. M., 1902 (hereafter referred to as *Gräff*). 3. R. Borges, *Über Schillers Einfluss auf Goethes Dichtung*. Diss., Leipzig, 1886.

the fall of 1796. Each of these volumes contained two books. Schiller did not see books one and two before they went to press. On December 6th, 1794 Goethe writes to him:<sup>4</sup> "Leider werden Sie die beiden ersten Bücher nur sehen, wenn das Erz ihnen schon die bleibende Form gegeben; . . . Die folgenden werden Sie noch im biegsamen Manuskript sehen und mir Ihren freundschaftlichen Rat nicht versagen."

A month later Goethe sent the manuscript of book three to Schiller and shortly after paid him a twelve-day visit. A good deal of this time was undoubtedly taken up by the discussion of *Wilhelm Meister* and especially of the third book. That Goethe received suggestions from Schiller we know from one of his letters. Toward the end of January, 1795 he writes to Schiller:<sup>5</sup> "Mein drittes Buch ist fort; ich habe es nochmals durchgesehen und Ihre Bemerkungen dabei vor Augen gehabt." What these suggestions were, and the changes due to them, will probably never be exactly determined.

In regard to Schiller's criticism on book four we are more fortunate. When Goethe sent Schiller the manuscript of this book, he asked him to make marginal comments on doubtful passages. Schiller did this and explained his objections to two of these passages in a letter.<sup>6</sup> In his first explanation he argued that in view of the tender relations existing between Wilhelm and the Countess, good taste would not permit the latter to offer Wilhelm money, especially through a third party, and that it was improper for Wilhelm to accept this money. He suggested that the money be offered to Wilhelm as reimbursement for previous expenses and accepted as such.

To meet this criticism Goethe either partly added, or at least considerably modified, the passage in chapter one<sup>7</sup> beginning with "Der Baron trat herein" to "Der Baron hatte kaum das Zimmer verlassen." It is clearly pointed out in this passage<sup>8</sup> that Wilhelm

<sup>4</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 58.

<sup>5</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 72 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 68.

<sup>7</sup> *Werke*, XXII, 4-8.

<sup>8</sup> In a footnote to this passage (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 197) Düntzer makes the following comment: "Merkwürdig wird von Schiller der notwendigen Hauptveränderung nicht gedacht, dass das Geld von dem Grafen und der Gräfin kommt, denn nach seiner Äusserung scheint das früher nicht der Fall gewesen zu sein." Where Düntzer gets this idea is not clear. It is nowhere stated that the money comes from both the Count and the Count-

has spent his own money to hasten the staging of certain plays, and the words "zartfühlen" and "Delikatesse" are undoubtedly due to the words "Zartgefühl" and "Delikatesse" in Schiller's letter.

In his second explanation Schiller pointed out that the three parts of the Hamlet discussion followed each other too rapidly and that it would be advisable to separate them by other important episodes. As will be seen by a comparison of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* with the *Theatralische Sendung*,<sup>9</sup> Goethe evidently also followed Schiller's advice here. In book six of the *Theatralische Sendung* the three parts of the Hamlet discussion follow each other in rapid succession; the first appearing in chapter seven, the second in chapter eight, and the third in chapter nine. This was very likely also the case in the manuscript Schiller had before him. In the fourth book of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* we find the first of these three discussions in chapter three, the second in chapter thirteen, and the third in chapter fourteen; chapters thirteen and fourteen in the main corresponding to chapters eight and nine of the *Theatralische Sendung*. We thus see at a glance what changes Goethe made.<sup>10</sup> Instead of letting the three parts of the discussion follow each other in three succeeding chapters, the first was advanced ten chapters,<sup>11</sup> placing the long hold-up episode between it and the second. We also find that the transition to the second part of the discussion has been lengthened and made less abrupt,

ess; in fact it is clearly indicated that it comes from the Count. Moreover Wilhelm has just received a gift from the Countess (*Werke*, xxi, 322 f.).

<sup>9</sup> *Werke*, vols. 51, 52.

<sup>10</sup> In his *Erläuterungen* (p. 22) Düntzer advanced the theory that Goethe either partly added or elaborated the passage in chapter fourteen, beginning with "Wilhelm hatte nicht bemerkt" to "Serlo der eben." Neither happens to be the case. This passage already existed in the *Theatralische Sendung* (*Werke*, LII, 237, l. 23—247, l. 19) and would not have remedied Schiller's objections. Düntzer later recognized this and retracted (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 236), advancing the theory, still more incorrect, that Goethe politely ignored Schiller's criticism.

<sup>11</sup> Düntzer very correctly felt that this part of the Hamlet discussion was out of place (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 208, footnote), but this clue was not sufficient to suggest to him the real state of affairs. That this part of the discussion was originally intended for book five is a mistake, partly due to the fact that Düntzer was not aware of the changes Goethe made in the Hamlet episode and partly because he, like other Goethe scholars (*Gräf*, I, 2, 732), took it for granted that book six of the *Theatralische Sendung* corresponded exactly to book four of the *Lehrjahre*, which is not the case.

but whether or not this change is a result of Schiller's suggestion will probably remain undecided.

The manuscript of book five Goethe submitted to Schiller in two instalments, the first, ending with chapter twelve,<sup>12</sup> in June and the second in August 1795. Schiller was charmed by the beauty of the first part of book five; his only objection was that the part exclusively concerned with the theater was too long. To this criticism Goethe replied:<sup>13</sup> "Um so lieber habe ich Ihre Erinnerungen, wegen des theoretisch-praktischen Gewäsches, genutzt und bei einigen Stellen die Schere wirken lassen."<sup>14</sup> It is difficult to point out all the passages which were shortened as a result of this pruning, but we can probably determine some of them.<sup>15</sup>

Here again the *Theatralische Sendung* is of assistance to us. Its last two chapters roughly correspond to the first three chapters of the fifth book of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* and are almost entirely made up of episodes chiefly of interest to theatrical people. In the *Lehrjahre* they have practically disappeared and it is not improbable that this is largely due to Schiller's objection.

To the second part of book five Schiller had two objections; first, that "Publikums" and "Publici" were used promiscuously and, secondly, that in the poem at the end a word had been used long which by virtue of its position was kept short, and *vice versa*. Goethe unified the genitive forms of "Publikum" to "Publikums" and apparently also remedied Schiller's objections to the poem. We have an earlier version of this poem in the *Theatralische Sen-*

<sup>12</sup> *Gräf*, I, 2, 770 f.

<sup>13</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 95.

<sup>14</sup> In his *Erläuterungen* (p. 27) Düntzer agrees that Goethe shortened some of the passages concerned with the stage as a result of Schiller's criticism, but in his introduction to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* he states exactly the contrary (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 14). The second conclusion is incorrect (*Briefwechsel*, I, 93-95). Cf. also J. H. Scholte, *Der "Angel-punkt"* in Goethes *Theatralischer Sendung*, *Neophilologus*, I (1915), 33-35.

<sup>15</sup> Düntzer claims (*Kürschner*, xv, 2, 26, footnote) that Goethe shortened the passage discussing the difference between novel and drama, but this is doubtful. If there was any shortening done here, it was not as a result of Schiller's advice, for this passage is of general interest. Moreover we know that Schiller was very much interested in it himself (*Gräf*, I, 2, 768). This error is no doubt due to the fact that Düntzer later took Goethe's phrase *theoretisch-praktisches Gewäsch* too literally. The letter in which Goethe uses this phrase can only refer to Schiller's criticism (*Briefwechsel*, I, 93-95). Cf. *Neophilologus*, I, 33-35.

dung<sup>16</sup> and by comparison we find that in the later version one word has been shifted from a stressed to an unstressed position, and *vice versa*. The two lines in question read:

- 1.) "Allein mir drückt ein Schwur die Lippen zu."
- 2.) "Allein ein Schwur drückt mir die Lippen zu."

From what we know of Goethe's way of transplanting poems from the *Theatralische Sendung* to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, it seems probable that Schiller had the first of these two versions before him and that the two words which were changed are "mir" and "drückt."

Although begun the first part of March, book six was not completed until the beginning of October,<sup>17</sup> and it is probable that Schiller only saw the first half of this book, the second not being completed in time to be sent to him before it went to press.<sup>18</sup> After complimenting Goethe on the excellent treatment of a subject absolutely foreign to him,<sup>19</sup> Schiller called his attention to the following faults:<sup>20</sup> 1. That the leading motives of the plot were not sufficiently emphasized; 2. that the story seemed to have come to a standstill; 3. that the religiously inclined might find fault with the flippant treatment of certain passages; 4. that the appearance of the uncle seemed to point to a crisis and that this would break off the religious discussion before it had received adequate expression.

Goethe replied to all of these objections, except number two. He granted their validity, but argued the difficulty of keeping the golden middle in the first, and stated that his plan for book eight and the remaining part of book six avoided Schiller's apprehensions in regard to numbers three and four. Goethe had to hurry, because Unger was waiting for the manuscript, and it is unlikely that he made any changes in this part of book six. To follow some of Schiller's suggestions it would have been necessary to recast the entire first half of this book.

Probably disappointed because he had not seen the last part of book six before it went to press, Schiller urged Goethe to have

<sup>16</sup> *Werke*, II, 260.

<sup>17</sup> Düntzer claims (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, introduction, p. 13) that book six was completed by the end of March. This is incorrect (a) *Briefwechsel*, I, 101, 105 f., 113, 118. (b) *Gräf*, I, 2, 782 f.

<sup>18</sup> *Gräf*, I, 2, 783.

<sup>19</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 80.

<sup>20</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 104.

the two remaining books ready several months before they were due,<sup>21</sup> and offered to acquaint himself thoroughly with the foregoing part of the novel and try to criticize them genetically.<sup>22</sup>

The effect of this new method of criticism on the final form of book seven must have been considerable. Of the eight months during which this book demanded foremost attention the two poets were together nearly four. At these visits book seven served as a kind of "Strickstrumpf" being repeatedly referred to as such and undoubtedly received a good deal of attention; but we have no record of the discussions at these visits and therefore no means to trace Schiller's influence on book seven.<sup>23</sup>

In regard to book eight we are more fortunate, for the final discussion of this book was largely carried on by correspondence. Schiller was completely carried away by the beauty of it and the novel in general. It drew forth from him a series of splendid letters<sup>24</sup> which will always remain an excellent commentary on Goethe's novel.

But Schiller also called Goethe's attention to a number of faults and in some instances suggested remedies. For convenience we shall treat these criticisms in two groups. Those of the first group were the following: 1. That Mariane has been unnecessarily sacrificed to the plot; 2. that Wilhelm takes the loss of Therese too severely; 3. that the sentimental requirements of the reader are violated at Mignon's death, by the doctor's premature speculations on embalming her body and by Wilhelm's joyous reflections on recognizing the band on the doctor's instrument case; 4. that the entrance of the Marquis is not sufficiently motivated, which could easily be done by making him an acquaintance of the uncle or Lothario; 5. that Sperata's story might be shortened; 6. that it is to be regretted that the epithet *schöne Seele* has been snatched

<sup>21</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 124.

<sup>22</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 122 f.

<sup>23</sup> The only change which we can definitely point out in book seven is due to Schiller's wife and is of minor importance. She called Goethe's attention to the fact that in the first book he had called Mariane's lover *Norberg* and in the seventh *Normann* (*Briefwechsel*, IV, 202). We have the manuscript of book seven and there the name *Normann* occurs twice (*Werke*, XXIII, 335). Goethe changed it to *Norberg* to conform to book one. *Normann* is the name used in the *Theatralische Sendung* and it is possible that the name *Norberg* slipped into *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* by mistake.

<sup>24</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 181-212.

away from Natalie; 7. that the reappearance of the Countess is not sufficiently motivated; 8. that Werner's children are too old; 9. that a few words of explanation ought to be given about the three misalliances at the end of the novel, preferably by Lothario.

A few days later Goethe sent Schiller a list of the changes he intended to make to meet these objections.<sup>25</sup> The list reads:

#### ZUM ACHTEN BUCHE.

- 1). Die sentimentale Forderung bey Mignons Tod zu befriedigen.
- 2). Der Vorschlag des balsamirens und die Reflexion über das Band zurück zu rücken.
- 3). Lothario kann bey Gelegenheit, da er von Aufhebung des Feudal System's spricht, etwas äussern was auf die Heirathen am Schlusse eine freyere Aussicht giebt.
- 4). Der Markese wird früher erwähnt, als Freund des Oheims.
- 5). Das Prädikat der schönen Seele wird auf Natalien abgeleitet.
- 6). Die Erscheinung der Gräfin wird motivirt.
- 7). Werners Kindern wird etwas von ihren Jahren abgenommen.

As will be seen by a comparison of this list with the first group of Schiller's criticism, Goethe intended to remedy all, except number one and number five; objection number two having been previously withdrawn by Schiller. The resulting changes can all be more or less definitely traced. Since we find no remedy mentioned for Schiller's first objection, we are probably correct in assuming that Goethe passed it by. Objection three, referring to Mignon's death, Goethe seems to have remedied by inserting the passage beginning with "Natalie winkte Theresen" to "Da die Freundinnen" in chapter five.<sup>26</sup> It is also possible that several minor changes were made. In regard to number four Goethe followed out Schiller's suggestion and made the Marquis an old acquaintance of the uncle.<sup>27</sup>

It is improbable, however, that Goethe took Schiller's advice to shorten Sperata's story,<sup>28</sup> for no such change is mentioned among Goethe's contemplated corrections, nor is it referred to by Schiller in his final review of book eight.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Werke*, XXI, 333.

<sup>26</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 204-6.

<sup>27</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 148, 240, 248 f.

<sup>28</sup> In his *Erläuterungen* (p. 30) Düntzer thinks that Goethe probably did shorten this story, but he later changes his mind (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 308, footnote).

<sup>29</sup> *Briefwechsel*, II, 17 f.

Schiller's wish regarding the epithet *schöne Seele* was likewise fulfilled by Goethe. The name *schöne Seele* is now used of Natalie on several occasions,<sup>30</sup> and on one of them it is clearly stated that she deserves this epithet even more than her aunt, the heroine of the *Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele*. Schiller's advice in regard to better motivation for the reappearance of the Countess was also heeded by Goethe,<sup>31</sup> for it is now clearly indicated why the Countess is coming. Schiller's eighth objection, referring to the chronological error regarding the age of Werner's children, Goethe remedied by changing Werner's remark that his boys are able to figure, write, and barter, and that he has already set all of them up in business, to the effect that he anticipates their doing these things.<sup>32</sup> Goethe also carried out Schiller's suggestion to have Lothario explain in a few words the three misalliances at the end of the novel.<sup>33</sup> He did this by letting Lothario theorize about an ideal state of marriage and very likely also added Therese's remarks on this topic.<sup>34</sup>

Goethe was pleased with the interest Schiller took in his novel and wrote to him a few days after he had received the first group of criticisms:<sup>35</sup> "Fahren Sie fort, mich mit meinem eigenen Werke bekannt zu machen." Schiller did so. The result was another group of objections and suggestions which continue the first as follows: 10. That there is too much of the accidental and supernatural which ought to be motivated from within the story; 11. that it is not sufficiently indicated what is meant by apprenticeship and mastership; 12. that Wilhelm ought to be brought in contact with philosophy during his apprenticeship; 13. that it would be well if the Count honored Wilhelm by a certain dignified treatment;

<sup>30</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 184 f., 307.

<sup>31</sup> Düntzer denies this (*Kürschner*, xv, 2, 301, footnote), but he overlooked the passage beginning with (*Werke*, XXIII, 180) "Er kommt mit ihr." He was not aware of the fact that Goethe had decided to meet Schiller's objection (*Kürschner*, xv, 1, 18, introduction). There is another error in this footnote. The letter Düntzer refers to is that of July third. We have no letter of June second.

<sup>32</sup> (a) *Werke*, XXIII, 135. (b) *Briefwechsel*, I, 192 f.

<sup>33</sup> Düntzer denies this (a) *Erläuterungen*, p. 30. (b) *Kürschner*, xv, 2, 252, footnote), but he overlooked the passage in chapter two beginning with (*Werke*, XXIII, 146 f.) "Wie viel glücklicher wären Männer und Frauen." Düntzer would no doubt have avoided this mistake, had he had access to Goethe's list.

<sup>34</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 184, I. 6-20.

<sup>35</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 199.

14. that it would be advisable to have Jarno tell Wilhelm that Therese could not make him happy and point out to him what type of woman would.

Goethe also met most of these objections and suggestions. When calling Goethe's attention to the fact that there was too much of the accidental and supernatural in the novel which ought to be motivated from within, Schiller pointed out to Goethe that people for instance might ask: 1. Why Wilhelm has been chosen as the object of the *Abbé's* pedagogical experiments; 2. why the *Abbé*, or one of his friends, plays the ghost in *Hamlet*; 3. why Wilhelm is urged to quit the theater and at the same time assisted in the production of *Hamlet*; 4. whether the *Abbé* and his friends knew previous to Werner's appearance at the castle that they were dealing with a close friend and relative when purchasing the estate; 5. where the *Abbé* gets his information of Therese's parentage.

All of these questions, except the first, are now more or less definitely answered; and the first as well, if we are to assume that the *Abbé's* words:<sup>36</sup> "Ein Kind, ein junger Mensch, die auf ihrem eigenen Wege irre gehen, sind mir lieber als manche, die auf fremdem Wege recht gehen" were intended as an answer. Judging by the first of Goethe's two letters to Schiller of July 9, 1796,<sup>37</sup> it is possible, however, that other passages are due to question one; for instance the paragraph beginning with "Es ist sonderbar sagte Wilhelm" and one of Jarno's remarks in chapter five.<sup>38</sup> The answer to the second and the third question we find in chapter five.<sup>39</sup> Question four Goethe seems to have answered indirectly<sup>40</sup> by saying that Jarno and the *Abbé* did not seem surprised when Wilhelm and Werner recognized each other,<sup>41</sup> and number five we now find satisfactorily answered in chapter six.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>36</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 167.

<sup>37</sup> Düntzer misread part of this letter (a) *Erläuterungen*, p. 32, l. 4-7; (b) *Briefwechsel*, I, 205 f. Goethe's answer is not negative, but affirmative.

<sup>38</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 167 f., and 214, l. 10-13.

<sup>39</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 215, l. 16-216, l. 12.

<sup>40</sup> In his *Erläuterungen* (p. 33) Düntzer states that Goethe answered question four by the passage in chapter one beginning with (*Werke*, XXIII, 134, l. 4-11) "Wenn Sie es nicht diesem jungen Manne" to "nicht bedürfe." But this is improbable, because it does not answer Schiller's question.

<sup>41</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 133.

<sup>42</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 229, l. 11-14, and 232, l. 2-26.

In addition to answering these questions Goethe seems to have heeded Schiller's tenth objection in general by adding, or elaborating, certain passages; as for instance certain parts of the last half of chapter five,<sup>43</sup> which are now largely given up to explaining the mysteries of the tower.<sup>44</sup>

Objection number eleven Goethe met only partially and not altogether to Schiller's satisfaction.<sup>45</sup> The latter had suggested using the second half of the *Lehrbrief*<sup>46</sup> to bring out the difference between apprenticeship and mastership, but Goethe used it largely to explain the mysterious machinations of the tower, and it is improbable that he made any attempt to carry out Schiller's suggestion.<sup>47</sup> The only change which resulted from objection eleven is in chapter five where Wilhelm figures as an art critic,<sup>48</sup> but this only indirectly bears upon the main issue.

We know from one of Schiller's letters<sup>49</sup> that Goethe fulfilled Schiller's wish of bringing the hero of the novel in contact with philosophy during his apprenticeship. The main changes which resulted from this suggestion are undoubtedly to be found in chapters one, five, and ten,<sup>50</sup> but it is difficult to determine what they were.

To meet Schiller's suggestion that the Count honor Wilhelm, Goethe either added, or elaborated, certain parts of chapter ten,<sup>51</sup> where the Count speaks of Wilhelm as an English nobleman.

<sup>43</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 209-21.

<sup>44</sup> In a footnote to one of these passages Düntzer makes the following comment (*Kürschner*, xv, 2, 272): "Wenn es in Schillers Brief vom 8. Juli heisst: 'Das achte Buch giebt einen historischen Aufschluss über alle Ereignisse, die durch jene Maschinerie gewirkt werden' so muss es siebente statt achte heissen, da nur VII, 9 gemeint sein kann." Düntzer is mistaken about this. The historical explanation of the events due to the secret society is not to be found in VII, 9, but in book eight (*Werke*, XXIII, 209-21).

<sup>45</sup> *Briefwechsel*, II, 17.

<sup>46</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 211-18.

<sup>47</sup> In his *Erläuterungen* (p. 34) Düntzer says that Goethe carried out Schiller's suggestion too far and suggests that a large part of chapter five (*Werke*, XXIII, 209, l. 18-219, l. 24) was perhaps added as a result. This in the light of the Schiller-Goethe correspondence seems very improbable (*Briefwechsel*, I, 200-13, and II, 17).

<sup>48</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 199, l. 7-201, l. 9.

<sup>49</sup> *Briefwechsel*, II, 17.

<sup>50</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 138 f., 211-19, 305.

<sup>51</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 291, l. 21-292, l. 23, and 293, l. 25-295, l. 7.

Schiller's advice in regard to number fourteen of having Jarno tell Wilhelm that Therese is not suited to him was very likely not heeded by Goethe.<sup>52</sup>

These are all the changes in book eight for which we know Schiller was directly responsible. There is another important change however for which he was indirectly responsible. When he advised Goethe that he ought to be more explicit as to what is meant by apprenticeship and mastership, the latter replied:<sup>53</sup> "Ihr heutiger Brief deutet mir eigentlich auf eine Fortsetzung des Werks, wozu ich denn auch wohl Idee und Lust habe."<sup>54</sup> Although Schiller very likely did not have this in mind, Goethe, after a consultation with him, nevertheless carried out the idea and added, or elaborated, several passages so that they pointed to a continuation of the novel. Such passages are to be found in chapter seven.<sup>55</sup>

These are the main changes in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* which can be definitely traced to Schiller. There is no question however that Schiller's influence was much greater, for the Schiller-Goethe correspondence can hardly be regarded as more than supplementary to their personal discussions. So far Schiller's influence on Goethe's novel has been greatly underestimated.

O. E. PLATH.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

---

<sup>52</sup> Düntzer agrees with this (*Erläuterungen*, p. 34 f.), but thinks that Jarno's jocose remark about the Abbé and Natalie and Therese at the end of chapter five (*Werke*, XXIII, 219 f.) may have resulted from it. This is very improbable, because the remark would not in the least have met Schiller's suggestion.

<sup>53</sup> *Briefwechsel*, I, 213.

<sup>54</sup> This is the first time we hear of a continuation of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* and it therefore seems plausible that we would have no *Wanderjahre* if it were not for Schiller. Fourteen years later Goethe says in his *Tag- und Jahreshefte* (*Werke*, XXXVI, 60 f.): "Der Gedanke der Wanderjahre, der den Lehrjahren so natürlich folgte, bildete sich mehr und mehr aus," but this is no proof that he did not receive the first impulse to continue the novel from Schiller.

<sup>55</sup> *Werke*, XXIII, 235-41.

## THE 1710 AND 1714 TEXTS OF SHAKESPEARE'S POEMS

Eighteenth century editions of the poems of Shakespeare (the whole number of which is not great, since the poems were not then commonly included with the collected Works) begin with two which appeared in 1710, one published by Lintott, the other by Curll.<sup>1</sup> The text of the former is based on the various originals, including the Sonnets quarto of 1609 and *The Passionate Pilgrim*; the text of the latter is from the garbled collection made by Benson in 1640. But Curll's issue, though less fortunate in its sources, is the more important for the history of the text, as it was followed by the later editors, like Sewell and Ewing, until Malone led the way back to the more authoritative early editions. A revised edition appeared in 1714.

The Curll volume of 1710 bears the following title: "Works of Mr. William Shakespeare. Volume the Seventh. Containing, Venus & Adonis, Tarquin & Lucrece And His Miscellany Poems. With Critical Remarks on his Plays, &c. to which is Prefix'd an Essay on the Art, Rise and Progress of the Stage in Greece, Rome and England." The significance of the "volume the seventh," as has been generally understood, is in the fact that the book was intended as a supplementary volume to be sold to purchasers of the set of Rowe's *Works of Shakespeare*.<sup>2</sup> There has been considerable uncertainty as to the editor of the volume, some authorities referring it to Charles Gildon, known to be the author of the essays it contains, others to a mysterious "S. N.," because in some copies those initials are attached to the Dedication. In the Cambridge Shakespeare, and certain other editions based on it, the readings of the Curll text of 1710 are referred to Gildon, and Sir Sidney Lee calls him "the editor of the supplementary volume of 1710."<sup>3</sup> On the other

<sup>1</sup> Lintott's collection is in two volumes, the first bearing the date 1709.

<sup>2</sup> See *Notes & Queries*, 2d ser., 12, 349, where the book is called "one of the piratical productions" of Curll, and Jaggard's *Bibliography*, p. 434b. In the latter, the reader may be confused by the omission of the opening words of the title, though they are given in full for the corresponding volume of 1714.

<sup>3</sup> Introduction to the Clarendon Press reprint of the Sonnets, 1905, p. 59 n. Lounsbury (*The Text of Shakespeare*, 1906, p. 73) puts it thus: "The

hand, the British Museum Catalogue says (in brackets), "Edited by S. N.," and Jaggard follows this;<sup>4</sup> while Leslie Stephen, in his sketch of Gildon in the *D. N. B.*, mentions him only as the author of the "essay prefixed to a volume published by Curll."

Having occasion to ask my friend Professor H. D. Gray to collate some passages in the Sonnets, in a copy of the Curll *Poems* in the New York Public Library, I was so fortunate as to learn through his careful memoranda that in that copy the Dedication to the volume (addressed to the Earl of Peterborough) is signed, not by "S. N.," but by "Charles Gildon."<sup>5</sup> The only other copies of the book which I know to be in this country are in the Barton Collection in the Public Library of Boston and in the Library of the University of Illinois. Both contain the "S. N." signature. A misprint which I noted in one of the latter copies (p. 428, "as" omitted at the beginning of line 9 from the bottom) has apparently been corrected in the New York ("Gildon") copy, and this seems to confirm one's natural conjecture that the issue containing the full signature is the later. Mr. Frank Chase, of the Boston Library, has suggested to me, "in view of the known character of Curll and Gildon, and the tortuous manner of publication of the volume of poems—the attempt to graft it on the successful edition of the plays, published by Tonson—that the suppression of Gildon's name may well have been deliberate, and the mysterious S. N. may stand for *Sine Nomine*." It remains only to imagine, as one pleases, what circumstances may have led to the later substitution of Gildon's name. In any case, as both Professor Gray and Mr. Chase have kindly pointed out to me in correspondence, the writer of the Dedication refers to himself as the author of the essays that

volume was apparently edited by Gildon; at least he contributed to it half its contents."

<sup>4</sup>Oddly enough, Jaggard inserts in brackets "Edited by Charles Gildon" under the *Lintott volume*, and in a note refers to Malone and Rodd as having connected the collection with Gildon. The only remark on the subject which I have been able to find in Malone is to the effect that "spurious editions of Shakespeare's Poems have also been published by Gildon, Sewell, Evans, etc." (*Works*, 1790, i, 234), and this doubtless refers to the Curll edition. See also Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times*, 1817, ii, 59.

<sup>5</sup>A subsequent comparison of the page with a tracing from one of the "S. N." copies shows that the two forms of the page are typographically identical, the name of Gildon standing exactly on the line of the "S. N."

follow, and the writer of the "Remarks on the Poems" opens them by saying: "I come now to Shakespear's Poems the Publication of which in one Volume, and of a piece with the rest of the Works, gave occasion to my Perusal of his other Writings;" hence if Gildon wrote any of the critical material, he also wrote the Dedication and edited the volume. And since we have at least one copy containing his signature, it appears that all doubt on the subject may be put aside.

The edition of 1714 still bears Curll's imprint, but would seem to have been issued in accordance with some arrangement between him and Tonson, since the title of the new edition of the Works (that is, Rowe's second edition) now includes the words, "To the last volume is prefix'd, I. An essay on the art, rise, and progress of the stage," etc.,—this being the supplementary volume of Poems.<sup>6</sup> The title of the supplementary volume is now "Works of Mr. William Shakespeare. Volume the Ninth," and the contents are, in general, the same as those of the volume of 1710, except that the Dedication is omitted.<sup>7</sup> But the text is newly revised, and in more than a perfunctory way,—at least for the Sonnets, to which my detailed investigation has been confined. This text is not listed by the Cambridge editors among those which they consulted and collated, whether from having escaped their observation<sup>8</sup> or from being regarded as a mere reprint of that of 1710. Lee also passes over it in his enumeration of the eighteenth century editions

<sup>6</sup> The Cambridge editors list the 1714 Works as of *eight* volumes, whereas the title just cited has reference to nine in all; and for this reason it has occurred to me that there may have been another issue with different title-page and with no reference to the supplementary volume. Lounsbury puts it thus: "To Rowe's second edition of 1714, which appeared in eight duodecimo volumes, this reprint of the one brought out in 1710, containing the poems, was joined as the ninth volume."

<sup>7</sup> The reader must be warned against an extremely perplexing aspect of Jaggard's entry of this book (*Bibliography*, p. 434 b). He lists two volumes of *Poems* under 1714, the one just described and another with the title "A collection of poems, in two volumes," etc. As this latter title was that of the Lintott collection of 1710, we are led to expect another issue of that text. To add to our perplexity, the volume is attributed to Gildon's editorship, and the only finding reference is to the Boston Library. No such book is known at the latter institution, nor is it in any of the British catalogues; it appears, in fact, to be a myth.

<sup>8</sup> See note 6, above.

of Shakespeare's Poems.<sup>9</sup> The only textual note making reference to it which I have found in any edition of the Sonnets is one on Sonnet 46, line 9, in Miss Porter's First Folio Edition, and this is mysterious from being unique.<sup>10</sup> In reality, this 1714 volume not only gives us a new and interesting revision of the text, but was evidently used freely by Sewell and Ewing in the subsequent editions prepared by them.

I can best show the character of this text by giving a list—since it seems never to have been collated—of the chief new readings it furnishes in the text of the Sonnets, classified, for convenience, according as they seem to represent corrections of errors or the making of new errors. (Such a distinction as this is, of course, more or less uncertain and disputable, but I base it merely on the consensus of opinion indicated by modern texts, and reserve for a third brief list readings of passages still in dispute).

#### 1. *Corrections made in 1714*

Sonnet 27, 2. *Q travail*; 1714 travel (so also Sewell,<sup>11</sup> attributed by the Cambridge editors to Ewing).

28, 12. *Q guil'st*; 1714 guild'st (*i. e.* gild'st; an important permanent correction, attributed to S).

29, 10-12. *Q then my state, (Like to the Larke . . . arising) From sullen earth*; 1714 then my state, Like to the lark

<sup>9</sup> Introduction to the Clarendon Press reprint of *The Passionate Pilgrim*, 1905, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup> In other words, of the numerous other readings of the 1714 text Miss Porter gives not one, everywhere following the Cambridge editors in erroneously attributing its readings to Sewell and others, or omitting them altogether. An amusing feature of her edition is that in the list of "editions consulted" our text is listed under the name of Darby (who was Curll's printer), and the abbreviation "Dar." is indicated for it. Nowhere in the volume, however, is Darby, in abbreviated or other form, honored by an allusion; the one reading I have mentioned ("cide" for "side" in 46, 9) being attributed to "Gildon, 1714." Since Miss Porter would seem to be guiltless of any immediate acquaintance with the 1714 text, I am quite at a loss to conjecture the source of this one note.

<sup>11</sup> The immense majority of the references to Sewell (hereafter indicated by S) are to his second edition, 1728. Indeed the number of agreements between his 1725 readings and those first introduced by the 1714 editor is so small that it appears probable that he made no use of the latter's work until 1728.

. . . arising From sullen earth (another permanent correction, followed by S, but attributed to Ewing, 1771).

- 46, 9. Q *side this title*; 1714 'eide this title (attributed to S).
- 58, 7. Q *patience tame, to sufferance*; 1714 patience, tame to sufferance (so S, but attributed to E).
- 63, 5. Q *travauld*; 1714 travel'd (so S; attributed to E).
- 64, 14. Q *loose*; 1714 lose (so S; attributed to E).
- 65, 6. Q *wrackfull*; 1714 wreckful (attributed to E).
- 69, 3. Q *that end*; 1714 thy due (an important correction, supplanted by Tyrwhitt's and Malone's "that due;" attributed to S).
- 77, 1. Q *were*; 1714 wear (attributed to S).
- 80, 11. Q *wrackt*; 1714 wreck'd (attributed to S).
- 97, 14. Q *the Winters neere*; 1714 the winter's near (attributed to S).
- 110, 6. Q *Asconce*; 1714 Askance (attributed to S).

## 2. Erroneous or unique readings of 1714

- 7, 12. Q *tract*; 1714 *track* (attributed to S).
- 12, 4. Q *curls or silver'd*; 1714 curls are &c. (an attempted correction, followed by S and E, supplanted by Malone's "curls all;" attributed to S).
- 14, 8. Q *oft predict*; 1714 ought predict (so S and E; attributed to S).
- 23, 4. Q *strengths abundance*; 1714 strength abundant (so S and E; attributed to S).
- 23, 12. Q *more hath more exprest*; 1714 hath not more &c. (not found elsewhere).
- 29, 12. Q *sings himns*; 1714 to sing (so S and E; not noted).
- 35, 9. Q *in sence*; 1714 incense (so S and E; attributed to E).
- 62, 4. Q *my heart*; 1714 the heart (not found elsewhere).
- 69, 11. Q *churls their*; 1714 their churl (so S and E; attributed to E).
- 72, 6. Q *for me then mine owne*; 1714 for me now, than my (a revision of the 1710 reading—found also in S and E—"for me now, than mine own").
- 83, 2. Q *faire*; 1714 face (not found elsewhere).
- 84, 14. Q *fond on*; 1714 fond of (so S and E; attributed to Gildon, i. e., the 1710 text).
- 85, 3. Q *Reserve*; 1714 Preserve (not found elsewhere, save as MS. conjecture).
- 87, 6. Q *that ritches*; 1714 those riches (not found elsewhere).

- 89, 9. *Q in my tongue*; 1714 on my &c. (so S and E; not noted).  
 98, 1. *Q have I*; 1714 I have (not found elsewhere).  
 104, 4. *Q forrests*; forest (so S and E; not noted).  
 105, 14. *Q never kept seate*; 1714 did never sit (not found elsewhere, but its influence appears in the S-E reading "have never sate").  
 110, 2. *Q the view*; 1714 thy view (so S and E; not noted).  
 111, 4. *Q manners*; 1714 custom (not found elsewhere).  
 112, 4. *Q ore-greene*; 1714 o'er-look (not found elsewhere).  
 117, 7. *Q saile*; 1714 sails (so S and E; attributed to S).  
 118, 1. *Q to make our*; 1714 you make your (so S and E; attributed to S).  
 118, 8. *Q there was true*; 1714 that was truly (not found elsewhere).  
 119, 1. *Q potions*; 1714 potion (not found elsewhere).  
 119, 7. *Q Spheares*; 1714 sphere (not found elsewhere).  
 125, 1. *Q Wer't ought to me*; 1714 Where it ought to be (so S and E; attributed to S).  
 131, 1. *Q art as . . . so as*; 1714 art . . . so (so S and E; attributed to S).  
 134, 4. *Q restore to be my*; 1714 restore to me, my (so S and E; except for the comma, the reading of 1710).  
 142, 2. *Q on*; 1714 upon (not found elsewhere).  
 145, 11. *Q fiend*; 1714 friend (not found elsewhere).  
 146, 7. *Q inheritors*; 1714 in Herriots (this extraordinary reading, not found elsewhere, seems to be due to the 1640 spacing "in heritors").

### 3. Readings of 1714 in doubtful passages

- 28, 9. *Q to please him thou art bright*; 1714 to please him, thou &c. (this punctuation, found in many modern editions, was followed by S, E, and Malone; the Cambridge editors attribute it to Dowden and Hudson).  
 51, 11. *Q naigh noe dull flesh*; 1714 need no &c. (attributed as a conjecture to Kinnear; since adopted by Butler and Walsh).  
 85, 5. *Q other write*; 1714 others write (so S, E, Malone, and a number of modern editors; attributed to S).  
 86, 11. *Q victors of my silence*; 1714 victors, of &c. (do.).  
 95, 12. *Q all things turnes*; 1714 all things turn (do.).  
 125, 4. *Q Which proves*; 1714 Which prove (do.).

The upshot of all this is perhaps not greatly to the credit of our 1714 editor, since his misreadings outnumber his improvements of the text; but at least he does not appear to be lacking in zeal and initiative. In general he follows closely the text of the Curll volume of 1710 (this, of course, does not appear from the evidence here set forth, but is obvious to one comparing the two editions), and it is probable that he used it as the immediate basis for his text; there is some evidence, however,<sup>12</sup> that he used independently the Benson volume of 1640. As to who he was, there is no definite evidence; but if Gildon was indeed the maker of the text of 1710, there would seem to be no reason to doubt that this is his own revision of his earlier work (he lived till 1724), and we may then properly denote the two Curll texts as "Gildon 1st" and "Gildon 2nd."

The influence of the readings of the 1714 text has sufficiently appeared. In the later editions of the eighteenth century they recur abundantly; and so largely have the readings formerly attributed to Sewell been shown to be due to the editor of 1714, that Sewell's importance in the history of the text of the Sonnets dwindles decidedly. Not that his text was "nothing more than a reprint of the poems as they had previously appeared," as Lounsbury has it;<sup>13</sup> he furnished, for the Sonnets, between twenty-five and thirty new readings of some individuality, apart from matters of punctuation and the like;<sup>14</sup> but the sum total is very little compared with what was done in the texts of 1710 and 1714. We may say, then, that if these two editions were the work of Gildon, he is the one important predecessor of Malone in the making of the text of Shakespeare's Sonnets.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN.

*Leland Stanford Junior University.*

<sup>12</sup> Such as the error noted above in 146, 7.

<sup>13</sup> *The Text of Shakespeare*, p. 73. Some observations of the textual notes of the Cambridge editors should have warned against the inaccuracy of this statement; yet in fact, as has appeared from our list of readings, it is much nearer the truth than one would have supposed.

<sup>14</sup> Of these a few are mere blunders; a few are corrections of some value, such as "One" for "Our" in 99, 9, "prov'd a" in 129, 11, and "I" for "eye" in 152, 13; two or three represent interesting guesses, as "o'er-skreen" for "ore-green" in 112, 4, and "me, thinks I'm dead" in 112, 14; and two are still *sub judice*, viz., "she gave thee more" in 11, 11, and "O let my looks" in 23, 9.

## DIE DOPPELDRUCKE DER ZWEITEN COTTASCHEN AUSGABE VON GOETHE'S WERKEN.

Von Doppeldrucken der zweiten Cottaschen Ausgabe der Werke sind bisher nur solche des ersten und neunten Bandes bekannt geworden.<sup>1</sup> Tatsächlich liegen nun die sämtlichen Bände 1-10 in einem Doppeldruck (B<sup>2</sup>) vor, der äusserlich, d. h., was Titel, Jahres- und Seitenzahl betrifft, durchaus mit dem Originaldruck B übereinstimmt. Dass Goethe von dieser Nachschuss-Ausgabe gewusst habe, ist zu bezweifeln, dass er durchaus keinen Anteil an der Korrektur derselben hatte, darf man als sicher annehmen, ob- schon die augenscheinlichen Druckfehler des Originaldrucks an vielen Stellen verbessert sind. Im grossen und ganzen bietet jedoch B den korrekteren Text, da die eigenen Druckfehler und willkürlichen Aenderungen von B<sup>2</sup> weitaus zahlreicher sind. Der Zweck des Nachschusses war also nicht etwa, einen korrekteren Text zu liefern, sondern einfach, die abnehmenden Bestände des Verlegers zu ergänzen. Nach Goethes Entwurf des Kontrakts (*Briefe*, Bd. 25, No. 7022, vom 20. Feb. 1815) wurde Cotta das Verlags-Recht bis Ostern 1823 zugestanden. Die Höhe der Auflage wurde nicht erwähnt, demnach darf man annehmen, dass für diese zweite Cottasche Ausgabe ähnliche Bedingungen, wie bei der ersten gelten sollten.<sup>2</sup> Der Verleger durfte also eine beliebige Anzahl von Exemplaren drucken lassen, musste sie aber vor dem festgesetzten Termine Ostern 1823 verkaufen: was dann noch übrig blieb, war Makulatur. Es lag demnach im Interesse des Verlegers, nur soviel Exemplare drucken zu lassen, als er innerhalb des Termins zu verkaufen hoffte. Augenscheinlich überstieg die Nachfrage Cottas Erwarten, denn im Jahre 1817, als Band 1-8 schon gedruckt waren, während am Satze der Bände 9 und 10 noch gearbeitet

<sup>1</sup> In der Weim. Ausg. XIV, 251 von Erich Schmidt, und daraufhin II, 299 von Gustav v. Loeper erwähnt. Dabei hat jedoch v. Loeper die beiden Drucke nicht immer streng aus einander gehalten, wie z. b. aus der Lesart zu 37, 15 im 2. Bande zu ersehen ist; andererseits fehlen im Apparate des I. Bandes auffallende Lesarten von B, wie z. b. 138, 50; 192, 21; 293, 2, die v. Loeper doch hätte bemerken müssen, wenn er den Originaldruck B benutzt hätte.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. M. L. N. xxvi, 133.

wurde, fand der Verleger eine grössere Auflage nötig. Die Bände 1-8 mussten neu gesetzt werden, sowie die Bogen 1-17 des neunten, und Bogen 1-5 des 10. Bandes. Für die Bogen 18-27 des 9. Bandes (S. 273-419), und Bogen 6-25 des 10. Bandes (S. 81-395), sowie für die Bände 11-20 liegt in allen von mir eingesehenen Exemplaren nur einmaliger Satz vor. Dass die ersten Bogen des 10. Bandes schon vor den letzten Bogen des 9. Bandes gedruckt waren, beweist die Fussnote auf S. 368 des 9. Bandes, die sich auf S. 21 des 10. Bandes bezieht.

Für das Jahr 1817 als Erscheinungsjahr des Doppeldrucks B<sup>2</sup> spricht ferner eine andere Tatsache. In diesem Jahre erschienen nämlich die beiden für die Besitzer der Ausgabe A hergestellten Gedicht-Bände, die den ersten Band der Ausgabe A ersetzen sollten, und dementsprechend den Titel *Erster Band, Erste Abtheilung*, und *Erster Band, Zweyte Abtheilung*, tragen. Das Datum ist 1817. Der Text dieser beiden Bände ist jedoch mit B<sup>2</sup> identisch, indem nur die Bognorm entsprechend abgeändert wurde: *Goethe's Werke. I. Bd. 1. Abth.* und *Goethe's Werke. I. Bd. 2. Abth.*

Obschon mir eine vollständige Kollation der in Betracht kommenden Bände der Drucke BB<sup>2</sup> vorliegt, sollen an dieser Stelle nur die interessantesten Lesarten aus jedem Bande angeführt werden. Dass C<sup>1</sup> von B<sup>2</sup> beeinflusst worden sei, ist kaum anzunehmen, trotz der manchmal übereinstimmenden Lesarten dieser Drucke. Dagegen sind in einigen Bänden der Weimarer Ausgabe die Lesarten von B<sup>2</sup> mit der Sigle B bezeichnet.

Durchschnittlich entfallen auf jeden Band etwa 300-350 Varianten, die jedoch zum grossen Teil rein orthographisch sind. Von den übrigen entfällt ein beträchtlicher Bruchteil auf die Interpunktion. In den ersten Bänden setzt B konsequent *giebt, dies, Punct, Capelle, fafzte, liefzest, geküfzt*, und ähnliche Formen, während B<sup>2</sup> dafür *gibt, diefz, Punkt, Kapelle, fasste, liessst, geküsst*, schreibt. In einzelnen Bogen des dritten und vierten Bandes von B, und fast durchweg vom fünften Bande an, finden sich auch im Originaldruck die Formen mit 'ss,' während dagegen die Schreibweise *dies, Punct* u. dgl. beibehalten wird.

Im folgenden Varianten-Verzeichnis werden die üblichen Siglen gebraucht, und zwar bedeutet:

S : Goethe's Schriften. Leipzig, 1787-1790, 8 Bände.

S<sup>1</sup> : Goethe's Schriften. Leipzig, 1787-1791, 4 Bände.

## DIE DOPPELDRUCKE VON GOETHES WERKEN 277

N : Goethe's Neue Schriften. Berlin, 1792-1800, 7 Bände.

A : Goethe's Werke. Tübingen, 1806-1808, 12 Bände.

B : Goethe's Werke. Stuttgart, 1815-1819, 20 Bände.

B<sup>1</sup> : Goethe's Werke. Wien und Stuttgart, 1816-1822, 26 Bände.

C<sup>1</sup> : Goethe's Werke. Stuttgart, 1827-1830, kl. 8°.

C : Dieselbe Ausgabe in 8°.

N<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>1</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, B<sup>2</sup> : Die Doppeldrucke der betreffenden Ausgaben:

H : Handschriften, wie sie im App. der Weimarer Ausgabe (W) beschrieben sind.

ERSTER BAND. S. 101, 2 Fallest wieder B (*Druckfehler*), Füllest wieder B<sup>2</sup>. 113, 14 Stunde denn noch nicht B, Stunde noch nicht B<sup>2</sup>. 130, 21 Die festen Formen B, Die besten Formen B<sup>2</sup>. 141, 2 Sehe Niemand kommen! BB<sup>1</sup>C<sup>1</sup>, Sehe Niemand rennen! B<sup>2</sup>C. Der Reim beweist, dass B<sup>2</sup>C die bessere Lesart haben: die frühere Lesart wird in Apparat von W nicht erwähnt. 195, 22 erneuern B, erneuen AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>C<sup>1</sup>C

ZWEYTER BAND. S. 29, 3 anzutreten.) B, anzuordnen. B<sup>2</sup>. 35, 2 Turn BC<sup>1</sup>, Thurm B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>. 149, 17 Deines gleichen B, Deinesgleichen B<sup>2</sup>. 186, 7 Stellt' B, Stellt B<sup>2</sup>. 198, 7 Seeligen B, seligen B<sup>2</sup>. 240, 10 Maas B, Mafz B<sup>2</sup>. 288, 3 Gedult B, Geduld B<sup>2</sup>.

Oben wurde darauf hingewiesen, dass die beiden Ersatzbände des Jahres 1817 mit dem Titel *Erster Band, Erste Abtheilung*, und *Erster Band, Zweyte Abtheilung*, von dem Satze des ersten und zweiten Bandes von B<sup>2</sup> abgezogen sind. Um dies anschaulich zu machen, sei auf folgende Stellen hingewiesen, an denen die betreffenden Drucke aufs genaueste übereinstimmen: Band 1, S. 171, 9 steht der Punkt hinter *hervor* zu hoch; S. 225, 11 steht das Semikolon hinter *verehrt* schief; S. 240, 11 stehen die zwei ersten Buchstaben des Wortes *Liedchen* zu hoch; S. 254, 22 steht *Reichmit* anstatt *Reich mit*; S. 297, 10 steht das Komma hinter *Pflanze* zu hoch; S. 321, 8 steht das *ch* des Wortes *mich* zu hoch. Band 2, S. 106, 17 steht der Punkt hinter *nieder* zu hoch; S. 142 unten stehen hinter *gestellt* zwei Kommata; S. 191, 7 steht *Jünglind* anstatt *Jüngling*; S. 200, 1, steht *Rceensent* anstatt *Recensent*; S. 222, 12 steht *verdients* anstatt *verdient's*.

Ferner ist zu bemerken, dass die zweibändige Einzelausgabe der

*Gedichte* des Jahres 1815, trotz der kleineren Seitenzahl<sup>3</sup> von dem umgebrochenen Satze von B abgezogen ist. Man vergleiche z. B. im ersten Bande die Stellen 101, 2 *Fällest*; 153, 9 *wohlbekanut*; 183, 3 *festllchen*; 208, 2 *Es war ein Kind' das*; 327, 6 *Bettinnen* (anstatt *Bettinen*); 356, 5-6 *vernahme'ns* (anstatt *vernehmen's*): an all diesen Stellen kehrt der Satzfehler in der Einzelausgabe wieder. Nur S. 277, 3 hat B den Satzfehler *Beglückten*, während die Einzelausgabe richtig *Beglückten* liest. Im zweiten Bande lassen sich zwar keine Fehler dieser Art nachweisen; es liegt jedoch auch hier derselbe Satz vor.

DRITTER BAND. S. 5, 17 Junker AB<sup>1</sup>, Junger B, Junge B<sup>2</sup>. 15, 3 und fleissig BC<sup>1</sup>C, noch fleissig NAB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>. 106, 24 Wie jammert NN<sup>2</sup> ABB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C, Wie jammerte N<sup>2</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 144, 4 Bändern und Flintern B, Bändern und Flittern B<sup>2</sup>. 199, 12 ohnerachtet ABB<sup>1</sup>, ungeachtet B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 226, 19 wie er letzt BB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C, wie er jetzt NAB<sup>2</sup>. 266, 3 Demohngeachtet ABB<sup>1</sup>, Deszungeachtet B<sup>2</sup>.

VIERTER BAND. S. 39, 21 die Weise B, diese Weise B<sup>2</sup>. 47, 7 sagte man B, sagt man B<sup>2</sup>. 75, 26 Mägdchen B, Mädchen AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>C<sup>1</sup>. 289, 14 Bildnifz B, Bild B<sup>2</sup>. 295, 2 Unordnung B, Ordnung B<sup>2</sup>. 346, 5 Freunden B, Fremden B<sup>2</sup>. 372, 18 regelmässig BC<sup>1</sup> (*Druckfehler*), rechtmässig AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C. 386, 14 genung B, genug B<sup>2</sup>. 437, 16 nicht B, nichts AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>C<sup>1</sup>C. 497, 23 ängstlichsten B, ängstlichen B<sup>2</sup>.

FÜNFTER BAND. S. 15, 7 zu heftig A<sup>1</sup> A<sup>2</sup> BB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C (*Druckfehler*), so heftig HAB<sup>2</sup>. 59, 2 Alcestens B, Alcests B<sup>2</sup>. 70, 24 begleitet B, begleitet B<sup>2</sup>. 172, 20 dein Reich BC<sup>1</sup> C (*Druckf.*) das Reich AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>. 273, 5 Arsirend B (*Druckf.*), Arsiren B<sup>2</sup>. 326, 1 Gewalt B, Gestalt B<sup>2</sup>. 336, 21 Krönungsornat B, Königsornat B<sup>2</sup>. 359, 3 Nun möchte ich doch B, Nun ich möchte doch B<sup>2</sup>. 386, 17 thöriche BB<sup>1</sup>, thörichte B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 433, 16 Staubgetümmel B, Staubgewimmel B<sup>2</sup>.

SECHSTER BAND. S. 20, 1 Schenk' B, Schenkt B<sup>2</sup>. 39, 15 wegeschwindet B, verschwindet B<sup>2</sup>. 48, 23 blinken B, blicken B<sup>2</sup>. In der Hempelschen Ausgabe führt Strehlke obige Lesarten von B<sup>2</sup> für B an. 56, 26 Weisling B, Weislingen B<sup>2</sup>. 70, 6 Wirthshaus BC<sup>1</sup>, Wirthshaus AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C. 133, 19 Geht mir ABB<sup>1</sup>, Geh' mir B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 152, 12 Ein Bündel B, Einen Bündel B<sup>2</sup>. 211, 7 Hast

<sup>3</sup> Der erste Bd. von B enthält VIII + 364, der zweite, x + 292 Seiten. Die *Gedichte* 1815 weisen dagegen nur VIII + 256, und VIII + 207 Seiten auf.

da BC<sup>1</sup> C (*Druckf.*), Hast du AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 406, 12 die erste Stunden SAB, die ersten Stunden B<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 414, 26 Vergebung B, Verzeihung B<sup>2</sup>. 435, 15 unübersehblichen B, unüberwindlichen B<sup>2</sup>. 442, 4 ist Buenco fort B, ist Buenco B<sup>2</sup>. 445, 14 über dem B, über den B<sup>2</sup>. An den vier letzten Stellen sind in W die Lesarten von B<sup>2</sup> als diejenigen von B angegeben, da R. M. Meyer bei der Herausgabe des *Clavigo* B<sup>2</sup> anstatt B benutzt hat.

SIEBENTER BAND. S. 23, 7 vorenthalten B, vorenthalten B<sup>2</sup>. 68, 2 sagt' ich's B, sagt's ich B<sup>2</sup>. 82, 15 Ist's uns B (*Druckf.*), Ist uns B<sup>2</sup>. 92, 1 Apollens B, Apollons B<sup>2</sup>. 133, 2 sonst verlor B, sich verlor B<sup>2</sup>. 134, 26 wilder Trieb B, milder Trieb B<sup>2</sup>. Weinhold, der Herausgeber des *Tasso* in der Weimarer Ausgabe, hat hier, wie auch an anderen Stellen, B<sup>2</sup> und nicht B benutzt. 147, 28 fodern ABC<sup>1</sup> C, fordern B<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 200, 22 fordre ABC<sup>1</sup> C, fodre B<sup>2</sup>. 236, 16 beyden Armen B, beyden Händen B<sup>2</sup>. 241, 11 Vollkommne B, Vollkommner AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 252, 19 diese Stirne B, dieser Stirne AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 257, 21 an jähe Klippen hin ABB<sup>1</sup>, an jähen Ufern hin B<sup>2</sup>. 260, 30 betrauren B, bedauern B<sup>2</sup>. 334, 19 mich bedroht B, dich bedroht B<sup>2</sup>. 415, 3 fürcht' er sie B, fürcht er ihn B<sup>2</sup>.

ACHTER BAND. S. 20, 23 Will sie nicht bequemen BB<sup>1</sup> (*Druckf.*), Will sie sich nicht bequemen AB<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. 49, 8 Gestehst mir nun B, Gestehst du nun B<sup>2</sup>. 110, 8 Blühet BB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C (*Druckf.*), Blühtet SAB<sup>2</sup>. 160, 17 Nebenthal S<sup>1</sup> AA<sup>1</sup> BB<sup>1</sup> (*Druckf.*), Nebenthal SB<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C. Die Weimarer Ausgabe verzeichnet den Druckfehler nur für B. 220, 9 schöne Gestalt B, schöne Gewalt B<sup>2</sup>. 302, 9 was es soll B, was ich soll B<sup>2</sup>. 332, 14 Weisen BB<sup>1</sup> (*Druckf.*), Weise AB<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 345, 2 wenn er B, weil er B<sup>2</sup>. 379, 11, 12: Dies Zeilenpaar wird in B<sup>2</sup> wiederholt. 440, 17 ich hatte Puls BB<sup>1</sup> (*Druckf.*), ich halte Puls B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup> C.

NEUNTER BAND. S. 14, 2 Schauspiel B, Beyspiel B<sup>2</sup>. 33, 28 ich hör' B, ich hört' B<sup>2</sup>. Hier, wie auch unten, S. 133, 10, hat v. Loeper in der Hempel'schen Ausgabe B<sup>2</sup> anstatt B benutzt. 35, 19 Pergament ist BC<sup>1</sup>, Pergament, ist AB<sup>2</sup>. 64, 24 Undene B, Undine B<sup>2</sup>. 79, 23 bequemen B, benehmen B<sup>2</sup>. 92, 14 dictirt B, dictirt' AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 133, 10 Nur fort B, Nun fort B<sup>2</sup>. 150, 14 schone meine Lunge B, schone meiner Lunge B<sup>2</sup>. 160, 8 Muss . . . gehn? B, die Zeile fehlt B<sup>2</sup>. 185, 17 Zum . . . Sänger! B, die Zeile fehlt B<sup>2</sup>. 248, 17 die Achsen B, die Wagen B<sup>2</sup>. Von Bogen 18 an sind BB<sup>2</sup> von demselben Satze abgezogen.

ZEHNTER BAND. Nur die Bogen 1-5 sind neu gesetzt. In der Regel sind diese Bogen gleichmässig, d. h., sie gehören in dem betreffenden Exemplare sämtlich zum Drucke B oder B<sup>2</sup>. Vereinzelt finden sich jedoch andere Zusammenstellungen, wie z. b. ein Exemplar in meinem Besitz die Bogen 1, 2, 4, 5 der Gattung B<sup>2</sup>, dagegen Bogen 3 der Gattung B aufweist. Der Originaldruck lässt sich dadurch bestimmen, dass der Zeilenschluss konsequent mit A übereinstimmt, gegen B<sup>2</sup>. Auch textlich stimmt B meistens mit A überein: an einigen auffallenden Stellen hat jedoch B<sup>2</sup> den besseren Text, welches dadurch zu erklären ist, dass die nachträglich entdeckten Druckfehler von B für B<sup>2</sup> vermerkt wurden, oder, dass die noch vorhandene Druckvorlage von B bei der Korrektur von B<sup>2</sup> benutzt wurde. Bei der Ausgabe letzter Hand wurden diese Verbesserungen von B<sup>2</sup> nicht berücksichtigt, da C<sup>1</sup> von B abstammt.

S. 7, 17 trete B, trette B<sup>2</sup>. 7, 21 alles was AB<sup>1</sup>, alles, was B, Alles, was B<sup>2</sup>. 10, 8 Schauspielerinn B (*Druckf.*), Schauspielerinnen AB<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 17, 22-24 dass er . . . Aufmerksamkeit hat auf sich ziehen können BC<sup>1</sup>, dass er . . . Aufmerksamkeit auf sich ziehen können AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 19, 13 Sagen sie B (*Druckf.*), Sagen Sie AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 27, 6 O Pfui ABB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Pfui B<sup>2</sup>. 46, 19 Wo deine ABB<sup>1</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Wie deine B<sup>2</sup>. 54, 10 werden! BC<sup>1</sup>, werden; AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 55, 1 wir bleiben BC<sup>1</sup>, wir blieben AB<sup>1</sup> B<sup>2</sup>. 73, 3 Heligthum B, Heiligthum B<sup>2</sup>. verzeih' ABB<sup>1</sup>, verzeih B<sup>2</sup>.

Die übrigen Bände weisen, wie schon oben bemerkt, nur einmaligen Satz auf. Nur das Inhaltsverzeichnis des 13. Bandes ist zweimal gesetzt, doch lassen sich keine textlichen Abweichungen nachweisen. Desgleichen ist die Musikbeilage dieses Bandes zweimal gestochen, und zwar mit einigen kleinen Abweichungen: S. 1 Ghiurig - hui - ma B, Ghiurighiuma B<sup>2</sup>. S. 2 Ca - da-ve-re B, Ca - dave-re B<sup>2</sup>. In der Gattung B<sup>2</sup> sind auch die Verszahlen grösser als in B. In einigen Exemplaren gehört Seite 1 der Musikbeilage zur Gattung B, Seite 2 dagegen zur Gattung B<sup>2</sup>: in anderen Exemplaren ist es umgekehrt. Welcher Stich tatsächlich der frühere ist, lässt sich nicht entscheiden.

W. KURRELMAYER.

## HOW SHAKESPEARE SET AND STRUCK THE SCENE FOR *JULIUS CÆSAR* IN 1599

An admiring German, travelling in England in 1599 with credentials that privileged him to see the Queen eat and to dine with the Lord Mayor also then made his respectful bow to the theatres of the English Capital.

"Every day about two o'clock in the afternoon in the city of London, two or three companies of actors in different places make it lively for one another which shall draw the best and have the biggest audience."

So wrote this German, Dr. Thomas Platter in his diary of his journey recently unearthed by Binz.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Platter himself visited two of these London theatres. Fortunately, he mentions them with particulars enough to identify one of them as Shakespeare's Globe.

On the 21st of September, he says, he "with his companions was ferried over the water to the straw-thatched house to see the Tragedy of the first Kaiser, Julius Cæsar, acted extremely well with scarcely more than fifteen persons."

Thanks to this item and to the adventurous research of Dr. Wallace who has made certain the other facts backing such inferences, we can now know that Shakespeare's noble Roman political play was written in the young maturity of his powers at thirty-five, in the flush of his successful launch into theatre ownership, and during the first year of his promising new partnership in the just-built Globe.

From *Julius Cæsar*, more notably perhaps than from any other one play of this period, may be inferred the strength of his ambition to be the master-hand in the stage managing of his new theatre. In this tragedy his skill in the technique of his own stage challenges attention. Unusual and bulky properties were used in the first three acts. He opens up his drama with a telling bit of stage business prophetic of his plot.

This stage business makes one of his special properties more than picturesque. It makes it useful. Attention is drawn to it conspicuously, and the entire action centering upon it is so shaped

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Platter's *Reisebericht* quoted by Gustav Binz, "Londoner Theater und Schauspiele im Jahre 1599," *Anglia*, xxii, 456-464.

as to cut into the heart of the political situation in Rome and bring it home to the audience.

"Certaine Commoners"—his Carpenter, Cobbler, and other mechanics of Rome—enter "over the Stage" to decorate one of Cæsar's "Images" with a ceremonial wreath and "strew flowers" along the path Cæsar was expected to take in his forthcoming Triumphal procession. Obviously the head commoner has just time to put the crown on the statue before the two Tribunes can enter and catch him at it.

They have their suspicions. They enter hard on the heels of those strewing flowers, and come on in the same way,—“over the Stage” after them to berate them for thus honoring Cæsar and strewing flowers in his way. They rapidly catch up with the leader and ply him with questions.

The words “over the Stage” in the first stage direction are the clew to the manner of these lively entrances. But for just these words we must go back to the stage directions of the original producer Will Shakespeare. They have been omitted from the modern text. Yet this descriptive stage direction is precisely what helps,—together with the inferences properly to be drawn from the dialogue as to the right action to go with it,—to make the manner of this first entrance plain. The head commoners—the carpenter and cobbler who “leade” their fellows “about the streets”—are meant to troop on with their companions from the place of their entrance at one side of the rear-stage, out toward the audience and then to wheel over to the opposite side along the front of the closed rear stage. Here the “Image” of Cæsar had been erected.

After the angry Tribunes had driven the herd of commoners away from the “Image,” one of the Tribunes—Flavius, turns back there. He tells the other Tribune to go down towards the capitol on the same side that the commoners had used in making their *exeunt*. “Go you downe that way towards the Capitoll, This way will I.” Obviously he makes for the opposite side where the “Image” stands.

He goes with a gleam of intention in his eye. He makes for it in order to tear off the royally banded coronet that the saucy cobbler had put on it. And he would have his comrade do the like by any other of Cæsar's images he may come across that are so decorated. The other questions their right—“May we do so? You know it is the feast of Lupercall.” Flavius has by this time reached

the place he made for. He flings his answer back over his shoulder. "It is no matter, let no Images be hung with Cæsar's Trophees." Suiting the action to the word, he snatches off the wreath. Having done this, he too turns to go off stage the same way the rest had taken. He lets Flavius know that it is his intention to follow him. "He about?"—and very much **as a boat comes about** is descriptive of the requisite action for his course on Shakespeare's stage—"He about and drive away the Vulgar from the streets; So do you too &c." Having by this time reached the place where they all made their entrance, he has come where he could toss behind scenes the offending crown wreathed with its suggestive royal band of ribbon. His words match the gesture. "These growing Feathers pluckt from Cæsar's wing, will make him flye an ordinary pitch Who else would . . . keepe us all in servile fearfulnessse."

Casca informs us later that these two Tribunes were put to silence for "pulling Scarffes off Cæsar's Images." Shakespeare takes the trouble to put this information into Casca's talk to tell the audience what came of this action. It completes the incident just enacted and gives it its full meaning. With his usual profound shrewdness as a dramatist and his usual skill as a stage manager he picked out this little episode from his Plutarch as the right thing to start his play with. The dramatic purpose of the first Tribune in returning to the "Image," his action when against his companion's scruples he dares to snatch the crown from Cæsar's head and fling it in the dust, brings out at a stroke by that token better even than his words the intense animus then uppermost in Roman politics. One party was quite ready "to choose Cæsar for their king." The other would brook "Th' eternal Divell to keepe his state in Rome As easily as a King."

Shakespeare obviously intended his third estate to hold both parties in the balance until he was ready to let the "Commoners" dip the scales in the decision of the questions Cæsarism raised. The manner of the entrances "over the Stage" toward Cæsar's "Image" endows that bit of stage business centering on that property with a dramatic relevance not to be spared from the right production of *Julius Cæsar*.

The craft of Cassius in making the noble Brutus a catspaw in the conspiracy against Cæsar is again manœuvred by means of special stage properties and effects.

The action during the conspiracy scene is kept well up stage and in the shade of Brutus's Orchard.<sup>2</sup> Sudden flares of lightning and rolls of thunder add to the terror of Casca's fright and Caesar's half-concealed alarm. Ben Jonson's scornful testimony as to the "roll'd drum" and the "nimble squib" that "makes afeard the gentlewomen" is authority enough for Shakespeare's mode of substantiating his repeated stage directions: "Thunder and Lightning" at the start of the scene, "Thunder still" a little later, "Thunder" again as Brutus leaves his orchard to assassinate Caesar—an appropriately ominous mutter left out by modern editors. "Thunder and Lightning," as Caesar, suddenly waked by the pother, bursts out of his house early next morning "in his Night-gowne."

In the gloom of the midnight simulated by such contrasts with sudden light, Cassius enters to do what he before said he was going to do "this night." But he would not be seen doing it and while throwing in a scroll at Brutus's window he is so startled by the approach of Casca across stage that he cries out "Who's there?" Nobody knows anybody in the obscurity of this stage midnight save by voice or gait. Only Cicero knew Casca at once. Shakespeare's intentionality in such stage details may be banked on. It is clear that only Cicero was accompanied by a torch-bearer. Cicero's torch-bearer opens the scene literally to make the intended stage night visible. Cicero hails Casca, notices his breathlessness, asks him why he stares so, and Casca has the "limelight on him," so to speak, to show the audience how scared this awful night has made him. Cassius, at Brutus's window, in the midst of his stage business of throwing in his scroll, is startled by Casca's step. So are they both by Cinna until Cassius knows him by his gait. He now gives Cinna the rest of his scrolls and the stage business with them is emphasized. He is to throw one in at the same window, place one in the Prætor's "Chayre" and set up one "in Waxe upon old Brutus's statue."

To the secret effect of this skulking about of the conspirators in the dark is added the obscure picture in the background aloft, of their mysterious movements as they assemble at their rallying place—"Pompeys Porch," in the upper rear stage. In Plutarch,

<sup>2</sup> For Shakespeare's habitual use of trees on his stage, see "Hamlet as Shakespeare Staged It," in *The Drama*, Aug. and Nov., 1915.

Cassius neither writes the scrolls nor throws them in at the window. Shakespeare, our stage manager, is responsible for all this.

Brutus's "Window" is again the occasion of an effective bit of stage business seeming to be introduced for no other purpose than to make good use of it again with relation to the scrolls and the darkness.

"Enter Brutus in his Orchard." Thus the original stage direction puts it more picturesquely than the modern edited form of it. Leaving his house, represented by the proscenium door opposite to the one by which Cæsar had gone home, the audience sees Brutus come out doors and amid the darkness of the foliage look vainly for the light of any stars to tell the progress of the night. He calls his boy to light a taper in his study. The audience is warned to watch for it when Lucius goes in to kindle it. From inside the window already made noticeable by the stage business of Cassius and Cinna, the little spark of light suddenly shines out. Masterly trifle! The remote touch familiar to every mental association of a lonely watch light at night seen from outside the house is gained. Besides, by means of it what was in that scroll Cinna had just thrown in is to be made clear. The boy who found it where Cinna threw it completes its story by bearing witness that it is the very one. He is "sure it did not lye there" when he went to bed. The nimble squib running on a wire sufficed for the "exhalation whizzing in the ayre" of that tempestuous night by whose light Brutus reads aloud this scroll.

By the time the conspirators knock "within" at the Orchard gate below, and then file through under the trees, muffling their faces "even from darkness," the ominous eventfulness of this stormy night for Cæsar and for Brutus too has convinced the nerves. Joint magic of scenic effects dovetailed in with the dramatic dialogue has wrought the miracle.

Plutarch mentions Brutus's "tribunal (or chair) where he gave audience during the time he was Prætor." But by the cunning of stage producer Shakespeare's scenic economy this chair serves a double purpose. It was the public pulpit later whence both Brutus and Antony addressed the people. This is betrayed by what one of the Plebeians says of Antony: "Let him go up into the publike Chaire." That it was mounted on steps is evident. Nor only from this one passage. "Noble Antony" is repeatedly bidden to "go up" and "come downe." Earlier, when Brutus went to

this same chair announcement was made that "the Noble Brutus is ascended."

It clearly was a massive looking chair, architecturally placed upon a platform built against the rear-stage structure. Its stairway down from the upper-stage balcony and up from the lower floor afforded Cinna, when sent to lay his scroll there, a chance to climb on up to the upper-stage balcony and do just as he was bid: "All this done, Repaire to Pompeyes Porch, where you shall find us." Cassius could have come on stage before, conveniently *en route* to Brutus's "Window," from this same "Porch" where the rest "stay'd for" his return.

The "Statue of old Brutus" to which Cinna also affixed a scroll balanced the "Image" of Cæsar, standing both of them on the ground-floor level flanking the rear-stage front. A tragic anti-thesis!—In itself a monumental presentment of the dramatico-political clash of the plot.

As to Brutus's "Window" there is a striking vestige of evidence imbedded in the dialogue later. It comes in then for a tell-tale mention that gives away the whole arrangement.

Besides the Image, Statue, Chair, and Window on the outer stage, there were set up inside the rear-stage Cæsar's "Seate" of state, the benches the Senators occupied, and the statue of Pompey at whose foot Cæsar was struck down.

After the fall of Cæsar it was Shakespeare's stunt to get the total property lumber on outer and inner stages off. This he forthwith does with vigor and swift picturesqueness, without break in the action and in the eyes of his public. Again he does it by means of unifying his stage business with his dramatic speech and plot-action at exactly the moment of balance the third estate holds in its hands ready to dip either way,—for Brutus and anti-Cæsarism or for Antony and the surviving spirit of Julius Cæsar.

The same speech that turned the scales for Cæsar, the same emotion aroused by Antony in the Plebeians solved also Shakespeare's need as a Stage manager. The Plebeians, driven to mutiny by the creator of Antony's eloquence, at one and the same *coup*, act as his stage hands to strike the scene.

They "plucke downe Benches,"—there go the seats of the Senators! "Formes,"—there go the Chair-platform and steps! They "plucke downe Windowes,"—there goes Brutus's window! Plutarch's corresponding phrase has no "Windowes" in it. Nor any

"Benches." It runs thus: "others plucked up forms, tables and stalls about the Market-place." Shakespeare took this hint. But out of it he used only what suited his peculiar purposes. It suited them to add Windows and Benches. An odd word—"Windowes"—to put in, otherwise!

All this to make a funeral pyre for Cæsar, to turn the course of tragedy at its climax with a "ripping" scenic mob-activity, and yet also clear the way for the bare stage, which the battlefield scenes of the remaining Acts require.

CHARLOTTE PORTER.

Boston, Mass.

#### DID BYRON WRITE *A FARRAGO LIBELLI*?

*The English Review* for August 1915 reprinted, from the probably unique copy in the possession of the late Bertram Dobell, *A Farrago Libelli. A Poem, Chiefly imitated from the First Satire of Juvenal. Printed for Mr. Hatchard, 1806.* This piece Dobell ascribed to Lord Byron, fourteen pages of commentary being devoted to the support of his theory. The world of letters rests under such a variety of indebtedness to Dobell that any opinion of his must be received with respect; but I think it can be shown, not that Byron did not write the satire (to prove such a negative in the absence of positive identification of the real author being impossible), but that we need other proof than Dobell advanced if we are to accept his contention.

Upon the life of no English poet has there beaten so fierce a light as upon Byron's, Shakespeare's alone excepted. *A priori*, therefore, the likelihood is small that any poem of his should lie *perdu* for a century. The chance is lessened when Byron's temperament is considered; it is hardly conceivable that he would write a satire, print it, and suppress it, without a single reference to it appearing in his letters. Dobell compares the suppression of *Fugitive Pieces* (not *Poems*, as he gives the title); but to that case Byron refers six times in his letters (I, 105, 107, 108, 110, 112, 113) and twice in his poems (I, 114, 247). Only evidence of the most unimpeachable kind could overcome the inherent improbability of Dobell's theory. Does he submit such evidence?

Much stress is laid on a long series of parallels between *A Farrago*

and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, with an occasional echo in other poems by Byron. The total impression may convince a casual reader—the force of such an argument depending largely on the cumulative effect—but, if we examine each parallel in turn (a task rendered difficult by the curious number of misreferences that Dobell gives), the value of the argument almost entirely disappears.

There can be no sort of significance in parallel references to ballads at a time when Scott, Lewis, and others were collecting or composing many, and translations from the German were popular; nor in the quotation of a specially characteristic passage from *Thalaba*; nor in the use of the word “letchers”—sufficiently commonplace and found, if it need be remarked, in the works of Dryden and Churchill, authors studied by Byron and the writer of *A Farrago*, and in fact by all satirists of “the decline.” Scott is alluded to in both satires; but literary satire of the first decade of the last century could not well ignore *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. Hayley, too, receives notice; it would have been more remarkable if two writers had *not* agreed in singling out for condemnation the author of *The Triumphs of Temper*. Nor is praise of Pope, the master of all satirists who follow him, noteworthy. And the argument is much overworked when parallel uses of the phrase “Poetry and Prose” are regarded as evidence of identity of authorship. Dobell emphasizes the fact that in two passages, otherwise unlike, the word *him* is italicized. To this the writer of a brief notice in *The Athenaeum* of August 7 (p. 99) has replied that the italicizing is merely an endeavor to stress the demonstrative pronoun as in Latin. This is certainly correct. Both writers use and italicize the word “hell” in the sense of a gambling-house. But the term was widely used just at that time and is italicized because it is slang. Both use italics frequently. But this is merely a survival of eighteenth-century form. In both poems there are strong expressions of dislike of Scotland; a parallel vitiated as argument (even were the resemblance not exceedingly small) by Dobell’s own admission that Byron was using “a common and vulgar accusation.” The author of *A Farrago* tells how at school he declaimed a passage in praise of a statesman; with this Dobell compares Byron’s allusion to the death of Pitt in the poem *On the death of Mr. Fox*. He also notes that Byron learnt to declaim at school. So do most boys; and most are fond of choosing the virtues of

great statesmen for their subject; I have myself listened patiently to dithyrambs upon Mr. Roosevelt. Finally, the untrustworthiness of this method of argument is well illustrated by the importance that Dobell attaches to the fact that in both poems Dryden is called "great" and "careless." "Neither," he writes, "are good or appropriate epithets, and therefore they were unlikely to be used by more than one writer." On the contrary, "great" had become almost the conventional epithet to apply to Dryden. The phrase "great Dryden next" occurs in Addison's *Account of the Best Known English Poets* (line 116); Pope has: "great Dryden's friend" (*Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, line 141); Churchill has (*The Apology*, line 376):

Here let me bend, great Dryden, at thy shrine.

The epithet "careless" is precisely in accord with the received view that Dryden was "less correct" than Pope. Dryden himself calls his verse "unpolished, rugged"; Pope speaks of Dryden's copiousness (*Satires*, v, 213) with evident reference to the comparative carelessness and hence abundance of his writings. In the *Biographia Literaria* (chap. xx) Coleridge uses the very word "careless" to describe part of Dryden's work.

With all respect it must be said that the impression left by this series of parallels (I pass over several even less noteworthy) is chiefly of Dobell's predisposition to find startling and confirmatory resemblances. These are not there.

His other arguments may be summarized and commented upon briefly: (1) The punctuation of *A Farrago* is in several places clumsy; Byron punctuated badly. True; but this is a fault to be found in many a privately printed poem such as *A Farrago* appears to be. (2) At the top of the title-page is an inscription, "From the author," which Dobell says is "a good deal like the early writing of Lord Byron" and seems to bear "a perfect resemblance to that of Lady Byron, his mother." Is it unfair to see in such a judgment a desire to hit the mark at least once in two shots—a good deal like Byron's writing and perfectly resembling his mother's? Has any expert in calligraphy examined the inscription? (3) Much is made of resemblances in cadence and rhythm between *A Farrago* and *English Bards*. It needs, however, but the slightest acquaintance with the satire of the period to realize how stereotyped those cadences that Pope had established had become.

The prosody of *A Farrago* is, in a word, of the hackneyed commonplace sort regnant at the close of the so-called classic period and surviving in only too much of Byron. A similar objection meets Dobell's argument from resemblances of vocabulary; he has neglected to recall the strait limits and hide-bound conventions of the poetic vocabulary of the time, limits narrowed further by the custom of translating Latin authors who supplied many writers with identical phraseology. (4) At the bottom of the first page of *A Farrago* is a note: "Written at Twickenham, 1805." True, there is absolutely no record of Byron's ever having been to the place, but "we may be sure that he would go there," says Dobell complacently, and immediately after he speaks of Byron's visit to Twickenham as though it were an established fact. (5) He finds in Byron's letters two uses of the word "libellus" and one of the word "farrago"—not, be it said, in proximity to each other. Upon this argument I offer no comment. (6) His lack of logic is most clearly shown in an attempt to draw a parallel between *A Farrago* and "Childish Recollections" in *Hours of Idleness*. In the latter poem Byron refers to a bitter personal satire that he had written but had, in a more generous mood, suppressed. This suppressed satire, Dobell argues, was *A Farrago*. There is no personal satire in it; "what I would suggest, however, is that *A Farrago*, as originally written, may have contained the 'deadly blow' which Byron speaks of; but that on his friend's submission the young poet suppressed it, and published his satire without it." Stated baldly this argument amounts to saying that Byron speaks of having written a personal satire; *A Farrago* is not a personal satire; therefore *A Farrago* is the poem to which Byrons refers.

Dobell answers by anticipation two objections that may be advanced against the ascription of the poem to Byron: that he could not have composed and printed such a work without our having some record of the fact, and that the style is too mature for Byron in 1806. To the first he replies that if he has proved that Byron is the author, then "obviously it is useless to argue that he could not have written it." Obviously; but has he established his case? The maturity of style he accounts for by the fact that Byron was following in the footsteps of Juvenal. To me *A Farrago* seems rather the maturity of dulness than the precocious effort of genius; the painstaking effort of some forgotten classicist, not the immediate precursor of *English Bards*. Two further positive objections

to Byron's authorship may be advanced. The enduring interest of *English Bards* lies in its scores of references to the poet's contemporaries; its satire is extremely personal. *A Farrago*, on the other hand, contains hardly one such reference. Secondly, for the model of his satires Byron was more indebted to Gifford than to Pope, as has been abundantly proved by Fuess. *A Farrago* is written by a slavish imitator of Pope; to set down my marginal cross-references would be tedious; any reader can establish them for himself.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

#### FROSINE'S MARQUISE IN *L'AVARE*

Molière's indebtedness to *La Belle Plaideuse* of Boisrobert for various incidents of *L'Avare* has been frequently pointed out. Among others Professor Moritz Levi, in his article on "The Sources of *L'Avare*," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xv, 19 ff., and again, in the introduction to his edition of *L'Avare*, (D. C. Heath & Co), has indicated the most striking points of resemblance. That the influence of the earlier play may serve to explain the *dénouement* suggested by Frosine at the close of the first scene of the fourth act does not appear to me, however, to have been sufficiently stressed.

The passage is a familiar one and need not be quoted. Frosine suggests a scheme for deceiving the miser and winning his consent to the marriage of Cléante and Mariane, by means of a pretended Marquise of Lower Brittany, whose willingness to give Harpagon all of her wealth by marriage contract would induce him to marry her and give up Mariane.

In a note to these lines in his edition, Professor Levi cites the play of Boisrobert for examples of the strange Breton names to which Frosine alludes, but not as a source of the plan itself. W. Knörich, in an article on the "Quellen des *Avare* von Molière," in the *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*, VIII, 51-67, mentions the fact that this episode is treated at length in *La Belle Plaideuse* and gives quotations showing the comic effect of the use of the queer names, but even he does not lay much stress on the resemblance.

In *La Belle Plaideuse*, it is true, there is no false marquise from Brittany, but a real countess whose title and wealth is at stake in a lawsuit. In order to dazzle the eyes of the miserly father and win his consent to her marriage with his son, she assumes the title and is credited with fictitious estates by her valet. She inquires about large sums of money, which she pretends are due her, when she knows that the miser and his friend are overhearing her. The father is so attracted by the prospect of such a magnificent marriage for his son, and for his daughter, whom the brother of the supposed countess agrees to take *without a dowry*, that he gives his consent, and signs the contracts, without further investigation. He learns, too late, that the countess is the very adventuress from whom he had been trying to save his son. A favorable decision of the lawsuit is announced opportunely, and the odium of the deception is lessened by the fact that the so-called countess actually obtains her title and estate.

In view of the well-established fact that Molière knew and used the play of his predecessor, in other scenes, it is clear that he had this episode in his mind when he attributed a similar expedient to Frosine's inventive genius. This will serve to explain, tho not to justify, the insertion of this suggested *dénouement*, to which no further reference is made. It may have been in the author's thought actually to develop it, as he had done other incidents which he found in the previous play, and that he gave up the idea because it would have failed to solve the mystery of Valère's birth, have rendered unnecessary the theft of the casket, and, in other respects, have been an inadequate solution of his main plot. In this case, the contemplated ruse would have been left as a mark of Frosine's ready imagination and fertility of resources, (which Mesnard and Professor Levi suggest was its purpose) and, also, to hint at other weaknesses of a miser's nature. We may have our doubts, moreover, as to whether the stratagem would have succeeded so well with the wily Harpagon as with the more gullible Amidor of *La Belle Plaideuse*. In any case, I do not believe that Molière would have thought of this if it had not been suggested by the plot of the other play.

Several minor points which, to my mind, are the result of similar suggestions, may be mentioned, as I have not seen them referred to elsewhere.

Frosine's plea of her need of money to meet the expenses of a lawsuit, which utterly fails to touch the flinty heart of Harpagon, is the same as that successfully employed by the mother of *La Belle Plaideuse* to stimulate the generosity of her daughter's suitor.

Much of the action of Boisrobert's comedy takes place in "la foire Saint Germain," which may have suggested the allusion to the fair in *L'Avare*, tho Professor Levi believes this refers to a different fair.<sup>1</sup>

The miser of *La Belle Plaideuse*, as does Harpagon, possesses a carriage and pair which are not in the best of condition. This luxury does not seem strange in his case, as he is not made out quite so stingy as Harpagon, and, moreover, he makes, or thinks he makes, a good profit when he is tricked into selling them.

Many little difficulties which arise in the interpretation of *L'Avare* can be cleared away if we consider them in connection with his sources, and, even if we cannot defend the dramatist for bringing in extraneous incidents or details, we can at least see the explanation for them.

CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ.

University of Wisconsin.

---

## REVIEWS

*The German Language. Outlines of its Development.* By TOBIAS DIEKHOFF. New York, Oxford University Press, 1914. [Oxford German Series by American Scholars.]

In the present work the author gives a sketch of the development of the German language for those who have not as yet made a study of its older stages. The book is divided into two approximately equal parts,—the first devoted to phonology, word-formation and inflections; the second to syntax. After a first general chapter on language and language study, in which the basic laws of speech-change are discussed, and a resumé of the Germanic dialects and their relationships, which belongs more logically in the second chapter, Diekhoff devotes nine pages to the explanation of the organs of speech and their uses and another nine pages to a classification of

<sup>1</sup> *L'Avare*, (Heath and Co., 1908), note to page 53, l. 3.

speech sounds. Then follow a lengthy analysis of German consonant development through the sound shifts and a somewhat shorter section devoted to vowel changes. In the third chapter the author turns aside from the traditional arrangement, which assigns to word formation a place after the inflections, and gives the *Wortbildungslehre* its proper position *before* the inflections. The treatment of word formation is quite thorough, covering more than 70 pages. The discussion of the inflections is prefaced by a discussion of the origin of the present German case forms and followed by a recital of some of the changes peculiar to NHG. Fully three-fifths of the space devoted to inflections is given to the noun forms, the treatment of verb forms being exceedingly brief. The syntax discussion follows time-honored lines, proceeding from the sentence as a whole, with its problems of word-order, to a consideration of the parts of speech. Here again the noun has received somewhat disproportionate treatment, as Diekhoff permits the analysis of case forms to lead him far afield. The same may be said of the discussion of the pronoun, which covers 65 pages.

It will be seen that in arrangement and procedure Diekhoff follows in the main traditional usages. The general nature of the work does not lend itself to originality, to which, indeed, the author makes no claim. His conclusions rest squarely upon the investigations of Wundt in his *Völkerpsychologie* and upon Brugmann and Delbrück in the comparative parts. Kluge, Luick and Wilmanns are the pillars upon which the first part rests; Wilmanns, Wunderlich and Blatz give the basis for the second. Diekhoff uses his sources with discrimination in most cases, with conscientious exactness nearly everywhere. One wonders, to be sure, to find in the bibliography no work devoted specifically to phonetics. In view of his preference for the genetic system, the handbook of Sweet might at least have been named. Furthermore, the explanation of the organs of speech would have been greatly aided by even one diagram, such as is to be found in Hempl or in Vietor's *Kleine Phonetik*. The omission of Sardinian and Rhaeto-romanian from the Italic group on pp. 32 and 34 was probably an oversight. On careful examination, however, the book shows itself singularly free from small errors and omissions. The author's conscientious scholarship has been well seconded by editor and proof reader.

Aside from the careful use and arrangement of existing material, a book of this kind must meet two demands, and may go so far in

meeting them as to justify a claim to originality as valid as that of any work of research. The first is lucid statement and illuminating illustration, and the second a careful selection of material, so that there shall be no more and no less than the purpose in hand demands. As a rule Diekhoff meets the first demand fully. Each section is developed from the general to the specific with a method and consequence which call for praise, and the selection of examples is in most cases admirable. Diekhoff has not the gift of terse and pregnant statement which marks the little historical study of Behaghel, but he avoids the diffuseness of others. His preliminary discussions of the laws of language, of word formation (108 ff.),<sup>1</sup> of gender (180), of the tenses (274) and the modes (295) are models of brief, direct statement and enlightening illustration, and I should not know where to look for so clear and practical a presentation of such difficult subjects as Verner's Law (66 ff.) or ablaut (88) or the passive voice (268) or the elusive "contemplative subjunctive" (312).

On the other hand, the author yields too often to the temptation to go far afield in the discussion of minor points, and indulges here and there in hair-split distinctions and fine-drawn definitions which can only confuse the class of students for which the book is intended. Such are the discussion of the influences modifying Verner's Law (68), or that of the somewhat shadowy "quantitative gradation" (89), or of the nature of the umlaut (96 ff.), discussions interesting in themselves, but out of place in a work with such limitations as this. The last-named passage, indeed, with its recital of the various theories of the nature of mutation, is one of the few passages in the book which lack clearness. The tendency to hair-split distinctions finds its way here and there into the syntax, notably in the section on the "psychological subject and predicate" (233), where the author shows an inclination to wordiness, otherwise absent, and in the entire section on word-order (242 ff.). The last-named passage, in which Diekhoff gives an interesting resumé of the historical theories of Braune and others, and an analysis of the position of the verb in the normal and inverted order, is one of the most carefully analyzed and interesting parts of the book, but it must be condemned as being swollen quite out of proportion to its importance in a work like this. Similarly, in

<sup>1</sup> The references are to page numbers.

place of a discussion of Brugmann's and Hale's theories of mode, a simple resumé would have been better adapted to the author's purpose, while the several pages which are given to the subjunctive in indirect discourse (315 ff.) might well have been cut down by half, and a still greater saving effected in the passages on the use of the adjective inflection in NHG. (429 ff.) and the relative connectives (489). On the other hand, the treatment of the whole subject of consecution of tenses (322 ff.) is a model of brevity and clearness.

Like anyone else who attempts to give an introduction into German linguistic development "without presupposing much or any acquaintance with the older stages of the language," Diekhoff gets into trouble very early through the necessity for employing illustrations which presuppose a considerable acquaintance, not only with the early but with the earliest forms of OHG. and even of primitive Teutonic. As a matter of fact, the student who uses Diekhoff's book without at least such a knowledge of OHG. and MHG. as can be derived from Wright's primers or a look into the works of Braune and Paul is in about the same position as the learner who would try to ascend into the higher realms of physics without knowing the simpler processes of calculus, he works with only one hand. As it is, particularly in the chapter on phonology Diekhoff goes to work very carefully, but in the study of the noun suffixes, and indeed, in the whole section on word-formation the beginner will very often be puzzled. Here clearness would have been greatly aided by the addition of a list of the corresponding forms in the various stages of the language, thereby relieving the vagueness of such statements as (146), "in the older periods, when vowels in the endings were still distinct, vocalic suffixes, as *-ja*, *-an*, *-jan*, were quite common." The author might have hesitated the less in doing this since he does insert historical tables for the consonants (62-65) and the verbs (71), and for the inflectional paradigms quite regularly.

A work like this must be judged by the demands of those for whom it is intended. The difficulties of the student who attempts to use any such treatise without knowing his older dialects will be considerable. For this class the usability of the book would have been materially aided by the insertion of a historical sketch containing a brief resumé of the various periods of development of the language, with a recital of such phases as the rôle of the medieval

dialects, clerical influence in the OHG. period, Notker's labors, the rise of prose, the development of the *Städtesprachen*, *Kanzleisprachen*, etc. Such a sketch could, without damage to the unity and purpose of the work, have enabled the beginner to orient himself somewhat as to that which follows. For, though Diekhoff's work is not, in the exact sense of the word, a history of the language, it must of course constantly refer to historical development, which, however much a matter of course to advanced students, is as yet unknown country to those who privately or in the university enter for the first time upon the intensive study of German linguistic structure. Furthermore, except for a reference here and there to the dialects, Diekhoff leaves the spoken language quite out of account. It is a question whether this is not false economy even within the limits of a work of this kind, as the *Umgangssprache* has a wealth of illustrative material well-nigh indispensable for an understanding of the modes and cases.

The work must be judged, however, by what it offers rather than by what it omits. It is certainly a book for which American Germanists should be grateful. A great deal has been attempted and the results are of high value. Its careful arrangement and wealth of illustrative material will be a boon to teachers who seek something comprehensive which is not at the same time superficial. Within the limits of a single work Diekhoff has given us in practical pedagogical form the results of a wide range of German research. The spirit of exact scholarship which pervades the book is in the highest degree refreshing.

ROBERT H. FIFE, JR.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

---

*The Freshman and His College.* By FRANCIS CUMMINS LOCKWOOD. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co. Pp. vi + 156.

*College Life: Its Conditions and Problems.* Arranged and edited by MAURICE GARLAND FULTON. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. xxii + 524.

*The College and the Future.* Edited by RICHARD RICE, JR. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. xxii + 374.

How to turn the bewildered freshman as speedily as possible into a college man is a problem which the growth of numbers and

the variety of the curriculum make increasingly difficult. Unless a specific course in orientation is provided, the responsibility falls chiefly upon instructors in freshman English. These instructors realize that in addition to teaching their students how to write decently, how to take notes, and how to find books in the college library and to read them intelligently, they must try to teach the freshman how to use the new-found liberty of the college and not to misuse or neglect its opportunities. For the latter purpose the books on college life are designed to help, serving at the same time as wholesome and pertinent reading, as specimens for study and analysis, and as sources of ideas for discussion and writing.

*The Freshman and his College* has the advantage of being a slight volume of convenient size, a consideration of importance in a book which is to be secondary to one or two others. It is devoted to matters of study and personal morals, as expounded by college presidents and teachers, rather than to vexed questions of college policy and wider issues of life and culture. The speeches are practical and interesting. Some, such as President Hyde's *Address to Freshmen* and President Eliot's *A New Definition of the Cultivated Man*, are admirable examples of lucid structure which may be exhibited in outline; and William James's chapter on *The Principle of Habit* is one of several that offer suggestions for themes.

In *College Life*, Professor Fulton has provided a much more elaborate work of the same general character. The essays and speeches are grouped under such topics as The Purpose of the College, The Curriculum, General Reading, Athletics and Recreation, and The College Man and the World's Work. The authors include, beside various college presidents, men of letters, for example: Emerson, Thoreau, Ruskin, and Stevenson; and the book is equipped with an apparatus of introduction, essay topics, and bibliography. The matter is excellent; one may, however, feel that it is so abundant as to seem forbidding and so varied that much of it must be neglected.

The most marked characteristic of Professor Rice's book, *The College and the Future*, is a carefully devised plan designed to lead the student in a logical progression from one set of problems to the next. The selections, which are less numerous than those in *College Life*, proceed from essays on learning to write, through descriptions of college life at Oxford, to the difficult problem of college athletics in America, the discussion of intellectual ideals

and general culture, and, finally, the broadest problems of life and society. If the book is to be used with a text-book of rhetoric—and it is hardly suited to independent use—the section on learning to write might well be omitted. The essay of Professor Rice on that subject belongs to the text-book; that of Mr. Arnold Bennett may be dropped without loss to the freshmen. The part of the book devoted to athletics, on the other hand, might be expanded by the addition of an article not hostile to intercollegiate sport. A bibliography of articles and books adapted to each section is supplied in an appendix.

In general, these books are a valuable addition to the equipment of teachers of English Composition. They should have a place on the reading shelf of every freshman class. For a few months of freshman year, any one of them will be useful in the hands of the students for use in class-work.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Phonology of the Dialect of Aurland, Norway.* By GEORGE T. FLOM, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literature, University of Illinois. Urbana, 1915. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. I, Nos. 1 and 2. Pp. 92.

Aurland is a region of the Inner Sogn in West Norway and its dialect one of the typically West Norwegian ones. While the dialects of Sogn have been characterized in a general way with reference to their most distinctive features by Larsen and Ross, complete descriptions of any of them were hitherto lacking. Nor is the present work a complete phonology, the important matter of the accent being, except for casual references, omitted. The author has wisely employed the system of phonetic notation proposed by J. Storm in 1881 and since then in general use for works on the Norwegian dialects. In the characterization of the sounds by comparison with those occurring in other languages the stressed vowels of German *Hütte* and Danish *Lykke* (p. 14) are erroneously represented as identical. The Danish sound is essentially an *ø*, and so regarded by Danish phoneticians. The sounds occurring in the dialect are illustrated by very full lists of words, the author prom-

ising a complete Glossary later. A selection of these words only, with meanings, is given in the Index. It may be right to include in these lists loan-words in quantity, but the question is at least debatable. In the reviewer's opinion they should be rigorously excluded, or if their occasional use seem desirable, they should in all cases be labeled as loan-words and their immediate source stated. The author himself seems not always to have distinguished clearly in his own mind the loan-words, as is apparent in the otherwise interesting part entitled "Etymological Phonology" (pp. 59 ff.). Scattered through these pages, but particularly numerous on page 75 are forms supposedly illustrating linguistic changes within the dialect which were obviously taken over intact from the *Riksmåal*. Others referred to as loan-words from High German, Low German, Dutch, etc., are of course from the point of view of the dialect not loan-words from those languages, but always or nearly always from the *Riksmåal*. The process in such cases should be accurately represented by Aurland < *Riksmåal* < Danish < Low German, etc. The reference to the *Riksmåal* as "High Norwegian" (p. 5) is inappropriate and will, it is to be hoped, establish no precedent. "High Swedish" (p. 26) is no better. The texts in phonetic transcription (pp. 82 f.) are of decided interest.

Typographically such a work presents unusual difficulties and the list of *Corrigenda* (p. 8) could be considerably expanded. To note only an example or two: *gutteral* (p. 76) is unpleasant, *L. G. Geburstag* (same page) is of course a slip; in the case of the phonetic transcription of words such errors may even be perplexing or misleading. One finds for example on pages 27 and 88 *hât'l*, but on page 79 for the same word *hätt'l*. Evidently neither is correct; the normal East Norwegian form for this word is *hass'l*, the West Norwegian *håtl*, with which last it is to be presumed the Aurland dialect corresponds. The author has in fact throughout used the phonetic sign ' employed by Storm before vocalic (i. e., actually syllable-forming) *l* and *n*, incorrectly, though his statement of its value (p. 17) is correct. The three examples there given: *hât'n*, *båd'n* and *håd'l* should evidently be expressed *hätt'n* (dissyllabic), *bådn* and *hådl* (monosyllabic). Such forms as *håd'l* with a short *â* are by the author's own correct statement as to the length of the accented syllable (p. 18) impossible.<sup>1</sup> This incorrect use of the '

<sup>1</sup> The reviewer realizes that the decision whether these words are monosyllabic or dissyllabic is not always an easy one, and the Sogn-dialects

together with the failure to mark the length of vowels leads to an identical representation of the phonetically very different words *ād'l* ("nobility," p. 85 and elsewhere)<sup>2</sup> and *ād'l* (p. 27 and elsewhere), which should be *ād* (*<all*). Not only the length of the vowels, but the position of the accent and its musical quality (monosyllabic or dissyllabic type) should in fact have found expression in the phonetic transcription.

The minor faults pointed out should not blind one to the value of this considerable contribution to Scandinavian, that is Germanic philology.

A. LE ROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

---

*Die Leiden des jungen Werthers von J. W. Goethe.* Edited with notes and a critical essay by ERNST FEISE, Assistant Professor of German in the University of Wisconsin. New York, Oxford University Press, 1914. [Oxford German Series by American Scholars. General Editor, Julius Goebel.]

Of all the standard works of Goethe, his *Werther* has had to wait longest for an annotated edition which would make it easily accessible to our college students. At last, Professor Feise has undertaken this task and we gladly welcome his valuable book, which by actual test in two successive classes, has proved to be a great help in leading the students to a better understanding and deeper appreciation of this first, and in many respects, greatest novel of Goethe's.

seem to stand especially close to the dividing line. It is not impossible that he has expressed a too positive confidence in the monosyllable. The point to be emphasized is that Professor Flom has not left the matter convincingly clear, and especially that one is not prepared for the occurrence of a short syllable *hād-* either by previous knowledge of these dialects or Flom's own statements, which would lead one to expect *hād* or, if the word actually is dissyllabic, *hādd'l*.

<sup>2</sup> One is inclined to be sceptical about the naturalization of this loan-word in a dialect of an entirely democratic people. In no case should a loan-word from the *Riksmål* be included in the vocabulary of a Norwegian dialect because a person speaking the dialect has been heard to use it; only general and widespread usage by the masses speaking the dialect could possibly justify its inclusion as a loan-word.

Preceded by *Der Wandrer* and *Ganymed*, the text, which is that of the *Jubiläumsausgabe*, occupies the first 170 pages, and is followed by a brief bibliography, in which the symbol G. W. for "Goethe und Werther," referred to on p. 264, is missing. The notes take up pp. 173-230, followed by three pages of Chronological Tables and, on pp. 235-295, by a 'Critical Essay.'

The text, which in the clear print of the Oxford Series is delightful reading, especially when we compare it with that in Cotta's *Weltliteratur*, formerly the most available edition, shows careful proof-reading. I notice only the following slight misprints: p. 92, 20 read *süsse*; p. 110, 13, *Tapfern*, 16, *zu-*; p. 122, 8, *dasz*; p. 134, 25 *widersprechende*. The reading p. 27, 10 *die zwei Herren Audran und ein gewisser N. N.* cannot be classed as a misprint for it appears in the *Jubiläumsausgabe* and, in fact, in all editions of *Werther*. Yet it is quite clear that it should read *die zwei Herren, Audran und ein gewisser N. N.*, for as there are only three ladies, Werther's partner, her cousin, and Lotte, there can only be three gentlemen to lead them to the ball-room, Werther, N.N., and one Audran; see also p. 28, 20 and p. 45, 9.

The notes are done with great care and are very helpful, paying attention to grammatical difficulties—which, perhaps, might have been treated more succinctly—and to questions of interpretation. Professor Feise shows a sympathetic understanding and appreciation of the work and so aids the student in getting a true insight into the character of the hero. I refer for illustration to such notes as those to p. 6, 27 (Werther a pantheist, the rationalist a deist); to p. 8, 4 (Werther can only experience by penetrating men, world, and universe emotionally); to p. 11, 28 *Einschränkung*, together with note to p. 26, 8; notes to p. 96, 8 and p. 118, 5. On one general point, to be sure, I can not agree with him, viz. that Werther is a product of the *Sturm und Drang*. It was Scherer, was it not, who first pointed out the remarkable fact that what is medieval, national in Wetzlar, the old ruined castle and the Gothic cathedral, do not exist for our hero, nor does Shakespeare. Can we really imagine a product of Goethe's *Sturm und Drang* in which Gothic art, medieval ruins and Shakespeare are deliberately avoided? No! *Werther*, altho it shows certain characteristics of that movement, is preëminently a product of the *Empfindsamkeit*; and we have no reason to change Scherer's dictum: "Der

sentimentale Roman hatte ein klassisches Erzeugnis aufzuweisen; Goethes *Werther*."

The last part of the volume is taken up by the 'Critical Essay.' There is, it seems to me, in our preparation of classical texts a dangerous tendency of "over-editing." To give a history of Goethe's development up to the work which is the editor's special subject is quite legitimate in the case of a *Lebenswerk* like *Faust*, but I think I am not alone in finding it out of place in an edition of e. g. *Götz*. Similarly, the long and detailed discussion of Goethe's Leipzig, Frankfurt and Strassburg days, in the 'Critical Essay' seems to me inappropriate for a college edition. The subject is well treated, I admit, but can we expect our students "to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest" this dissertation? Considering the nature, attitude and mental capacity of our students, I think a brief discussion of Rousseau's *Nouvelle Héloïse*, undoubtedly in many respects the model for *Werther*, and some remarks on the international success of this wonderful novel should have been given. What will arouse more interest for the "problematical" hero, to reprint some of the sophomoric epistles of the immature Leipzig student to his sister, or to speak, for example, of Napoleon as a reader and admirer of the book, or of its spread into France, England, the United States?

The illustrations, made from souvenir postal cards, add no value to the book, with the possible exception of the *Goethebrunnen*. If we are not to have the illustrations of earliest *Werther* editions or perhaps a picture of the young Goethe, or Charlotte Buff or *Lottens Schattenriss*, we will do better with an unadorned edition.

MAX F. BLAU.

Princeton University.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### CHAUCER AND HORACE

Eight <sup>1</sup> passages have been pointed out <sup>2</sup> in which Chaucer apparently had lines from Horace in mind. For five of these, convenient second-hand sources have already been suggested:

(1) In *The Tale of Melibeus*, ¶ 50 (C. T. B 2752), the sentence,

And right so as by riches the comen manye goodes, right so by  
poverty come the manye harmes and yveles,

points to Horace, *Epistle* 1.6.37:

et genus et formam regina pecunia donat.

Skeat <sup>3</sup> notes that this line occurs in the Latin version of the story, the *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* of Albertano of Brescia.<sup>4</sup> It is also quoted—along with the line which follows it in the epistle—by John of Salisbury in the *Polycraticus* 5.17 and in the *Metalogicus* 1.4.<sup>5</sup>

(2) Lines 56-58 of *The Maunciples Tale* (C. T. H 160-162),

But god it woot, the may no man embrace  
As to destreyne a thing, which that nature  
Hath naturelly set in a creature,

call to mind Horace, *Epistle* 1.10.24:

Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.

"And this," according to Skeat, "is the very passage which Chaucer had in view, as it is quoted and commented on in *Le Roman de la Rose* 14221-8."<sup>6</sup> Dr. G. L. Hamilton<sup>7</sup> points out that John of Salisbury likewise quotes this line <sup>8</sup> in the *Polycraticus* 3.8.

<sup>1</sup> Not counting the references to Lollius as a writer on the Trojan War. For Horace's probable connection with Chaucer's Lollius, see K. Young in Chaucer Society Publications, 2nd ser., no. 40, Appendix C, pp. 189-195.

<sup>2</sup> See E. P. Hammond: *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*, pp. 91, 92.

<sup>3</sup> W. W. Skeat: *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v, 219.

<sup>4</sup> See edition by Thor Sundby for Chaucer Society (1873), p. 98.

<sup>5</sup> See Keller and Holder's ed. of Horace (Leipzig, 1864), ii, p. 221.

<sup>6</sup> Skeat, v, 439.

<sup>7</sup> G. L. Hamilton: *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde to Guido Delle Colonne's Historia Trojana*, pp. 143 f.

<sup>8</sup> With the omission of the first word.

- (3) In lines 251, 252 of the same tale (*C. T. H* 355, 356),

Thing that is seyð, is seyð; and forth it gooth  
Though him repente, or be him leef or looth,

Chaucer appears to be echoing the thought of Horace *Epistle* 1. 18.71:

et semel emissum volat irrevocabile verbum.

He may have found the line, as Skeat observes,<sup>9</sup> in *Le Roman de la Rose* 16746-8, or in the *Liber Consolationis et Consilii*.<sup>10</sup>

- (4) In this tale again, lines 12-14 (*C. T. H* 116-118),

Certes the king of Thebes, Amphioun,  
That with his singing walled that citee,  
Coude never singen half so wel as he,

remind us of Horace, *Ars Poetica* 394 f.:

dictus et Amphion, Thebanæ conditor urbis  
saxa movere sono testudinis et prece blanda  
ducere quo vellet.

But the story of Amphion is such a commonplace in medieval literature that there is no special reason for thinking that Chaucer went to Horace for it. Lounsbury notes<sup>11</sup> that it is referred to more than once by Statius, and that it is given in full by Boccaccio in the *De Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*.<sup>12</sup>

- (5) Lines 164-166 of the B-version of the Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women*,

But I ne clepe nat innocence folye,  
Ne fals pitee, for 'vertu is the mene,'  
As Etik saith, in swich maner I mene,

contain, as Professor Lowes has pointed out,<sup>13</sup> the same doctrine as is expressed in Horace *Epistle* I.18.9:

virtus est medium vitiorum et utrimque reductum.

Professor Lowes calls attention to the fact that the Latin line is paraphrased by John of Salisbury in the *Polycraticus* 8.13.<sup>14</sup>

For the following three passages, the editors of Chaucer have not pointed out, so far as I know, any ready second-hand references:

<sup>9</sup> Skeat, v, 443.

<sup>10</sup> See Thor Sundby, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

<sup>11</sup> T. R. Lounsbury: *Studies in Chaucer*, ii, 262.

<sup>12</sup> Lib. v, cap. 30. For Chaucer's familiarity with this work, see Lounsbury, ii, 232 f.

<sup>13</sup> See the article on Chaucer's "Etik" in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxv, 87-89.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

(1) Lines 22 ff. in Book ii of *Troilus and Criseyde*,

Ye knowe eek, that in forme of speche is chaunge  
 With-inne a thousand yeer, and wordes tho  
 That hadden prys, now wonder nyce and straunge  
 Us thinketh hem; and yet they spake hem so, etc.—

are apparently borrowed from Horace, *Ars Poetica* 70-72:

Multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque  
 quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,  
 quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.

But since quotations from the *Ars Poetica* were so frequent in the Middle Ages,<sup>15</sup> we need not suppose that Chaucer took the verses directly from Horace. John of Salisbury quotes them twice in the *Metalogicus*,<sup>16</sup> and it is just possible that Chaucer copied them from him.<sup>17</sup>

(2) Lines 1028-1036 of the second book of *Troilus and Criseyde*—where Chaucer refers to the harper who plays continually on one string—recall the *Ars Poetica* 355-356:<sup>18</sup>

ut citharoedus  
 Ridetur chorda qui semper oberrat eadem.

But, in all probability, the phrase "harping on one string" became proverbial at an early date, and hence this proves nothing as to Chaucer's familiarity with Horace.<sup>19</sup>

(3) Lines 1041-1043 of the same book of *Troilus and Criseyde*,

For if a peyntour wolde peynte a pyk  
 With asses feet, and hede it as an ape  
 It cordeth nought; so nere it but a Iape,

<sup>15</sup> Skeat, II, lii f.

<sup>16</sup> *Metalogicus* 1.16 and 3.3. See J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, 2nd series, vol. 199 (Paris, 1855). Line 72 is quoted again in the same work 3.4. See Keller and Holder, *op. cit.*, ii, 336.

<sup>17</sup> To my knowledge, there are no other instances of Chaucer's borrowing from the *Metalogicus*.

<sup>18</sup> Lounsbury, II, 261.

<sup>19</sup> Skeat includes this passage from Chaucer in his *Early English Proverbs*, p. 70. In *The Proverbs, Epigrams and Miscellanies* of John Heywood, we find such expressions as "Ye harp on the string that giveth no melody," "harping on that string," "Harp no more on that string" (See edition by J. S. Farmer, London, 1906, pp. 63, 96, 184). Lounsbury, in commenting upon this passage, says (ii, 262) that it is "one of those comparisons that are too inevitable in their nature to warrant the drawing of inferences of any sort." I have not been able to find any second-hand source where Chaucer might conveniently have found Horace quoted.

are certainly very much like the opening verses of the *Ars Poetica*. "While the objects selected for comparison vary, the ideas are essentially the same."<sup>20</sup> In this case, John of Salisbury again may have been Chaucer's source, for Horace's verses are partly quoted in the *Polycraticus* 2.18:<sup>21</sup>

disiuncta coniungit, ut si humano capiti cervicem iungat equinam varias  
inducens undique plumas, ut iuxta poetam turpiter atrum desinat in piscem  
mulier formosa superne.<sup>22</sup>

HARRIET SEIBERT.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### SOURCES OF *In Memoriam* IN TENNYSON'S EARLY POEMS

Among the discarded poems of Tennyson's 1830 volume is a group of somewhat irregular sonnets entitled "Love."<sup>1</sup> The first nineteen lines of the group express the central conceptions of *In Memoriam* with remarkable fidelity to its spirit and phraseology. When we consider that these sonnets were written more than three years before the death of Hallam, the significance of the parallel becomes apparent.

Few of the author's discarded poems have been suppressed as effectually as these sonnets. Omitted from every authorized edition since their first appearance, they are ignored as completely in Baker's *Concordance* of 1914 as in Brightwell's of 1869. It is true that they have recently come into print again (as in Collins' *The Early Poems of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, and in the appendix to Rolfe's edition of the *Works*); but here it is only an inconspicuous appearance in small type and without comment.

As far back as 1879 it was suggested<sup>2</sup> that "it is . . . indispensable to the right understanding of *In Memoriam* that we should see what Tennyson had actually accomplished during the life-time of Hallam;" but as far as I have been able to learn, there

<sup>20</sup> Lounsbury, II, 262; Skeat, II, 472.

<sup>21</sup> John of Salisbury quotes the 4th line of this passage again in the *Polycraticus* 2.15. See Keller and Holder, *op. cit.*, II, 327, 8.

<sup>22</sup> For Chaucer's knowledge of the *Polycraticus*, see Lounsbury, II, 362-4; Hamilton, pp. 143 f.; W. W. Woolcombe in Chaucer Society Essays, 2nd ser., no. 16, pp. 295 ff. (an argument that Chaucer was not a borrower from John of Salisbury); J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 100; also see John of Salisbury in index of Skeat, vol. VI.

<sup>1</sup> The third of the group contains sixteen lines.

<sup>2</sup> Shepherd's *Tennysonian*, 2d ed., 1879, p. 26.

has been, as yet, no systematic study of the subject. Certain parallels have been noted,<sup>3</sup> chiefly in matters of phraseology, between the *Poems by Two Brothers* and *In Memoriam*, but these can hardly be supposed to have great significance. *The Two Voices* is often mentioned as a companion poem to the elegy, but its uncertain date forbids a fair comparison. It was not begun until the year of Hallam's death, and may even be considered little earlier than some parts of *In Memoriam* which it most resembles.

In addition to these, scattered lines in the volumes of 1830 and 1833 show resemblances to the later poem in single details. The immortality of love was a favorite theme of Tennyson's before he had attained his majority; witness the following lines:

Life, anguish, death, immortal love<sup>4</sup>  
And it sings a song of undying love<sup>5</sup>

The power of love over death is implied in his reference to  
her, who knew that Love can conquer Death<sup>6</sup>

The scientific spirit of inquiry, coupled with a desire to seek a higher knowledge from love, is already preluded in these lines:

thy love  
Enlighten me. Oh teach me yet  
Somewhat before the heavy clod  
Weighs on me, and the busy fret  
Of that sharpheaded worm begins  
In the gross blackness underneath.<sup>7</sup>

But far more significant than these fragments is the notable resemblance which the three sonnets bear to *In Memoriam*. The following passage expresses in a condensed form all, or nearly all, of the central conceptions of the later poem:<sup>8</sup>

I

Thou, from the first, unborn, undying love,  
Albeit we gaze not on thy glories near,  
Before the face of God did'st breathe and move,  
Though night and pain and ruin and death reign here.  
Thou foldest, like a golden atmosphere,  
The very throne of the eternal God:  
Passing through thee the edicts of his fear  
Are mellowed into music, borne abroad  
By the loud winds, though they uprend the sea,  
Even from its central deeps: thine empery

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Recollections of the Arabian Nights*, l. 73, edition of 1830. In this and the subsequent citations, all references are to the original editions of 1830 and 1833 for the early poems, and to the authorized edition of 1911 for *In Memoriam*.

<sup>5</sup> *The Poet's Mind*, l. 33.

<sup>6</sup> *A Dream of Fair Women*, l. 297.

<sup>7</sup> *Supposed Confessions of a Secondrate Sensitive Mind Not in Unity with Itself*, l. 182 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Love*, l. 19.

Is over all: thou wilt not brook eclipse;  
 Thou goest and returnest to His lips  
 Like lightning: thou dost ever brood above  
 The silence of all hearts, unutterable Love.

## II

To know thee is all wisdom, and old age  
 Is but to know thee: dimly we behold thee  
 Athwart the veils of evil which infold thee.  
 We beat upon our aching hearts in rage;  
 We cry for thee

The similarities of diction and imagery are much less important than those of thought, but the following detailed comparisons may be suggestive:

Strong Son of God, immortal Love,  
 Whom we, that have not seen thy face<sup>9</sup>—Cf. *Love*, I, 1-2.  
 Who trusted God was love indeed  
 And love Creation's final law<sup>10</sup>—Cf. I, 4-8.  
 That mind and soul, according well,  
 May make one music as before<sup>11</sup>—Cf. I, 7-8.  
 No lapse of moons can canker Love<sup>12</sup>—Cf. I, 11.  
 in thy wisdom make me wise<sup>13</sup>—Cf. II, 1-2.  
 What hope of answer, or redress?  
 Behind the veil, behind the veil<sup>14</sup>—Cf. II, 2-3.  
 To lull with song an aching heart<sup>15</sup>—Cf. II, 4.  
 An infant crying in the night<sup>16</sup>—Cf. II, 5.

It would seem, then, that Tennyson's conception of the divinity and immortality of love, its relation to law in life, and its importance to the individual, were much the same before Hallam's death as afterwards. Already we find him insisting that love must be taken as a matter of faith (l. 2) and of human experience (ll. 13-14). Already we find him expressing his mystical doctrine of the nature of love in the terms of contemporary theology, but with a different signification.

But there is nothing in the sonnets corresponding to the choral songs scattered through *In Memoriam*, which tell of the poet's feeling toward his own art. It is especially suggestive to compare the early line "We beat upon our aching hearts in rage" with the corresponding line of the later poem, "To lull with song an aching heart." The author had not yet learned how dear to him his art would prove. When the real sorrow came into his life, he did not beat upon his heart in rage, but found relief in song.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE.

University of Wisconsin.

<sup>9</sup> *In Memoriam*, Prologue, 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, LVI, 18.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, Prologue, 27-28.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVI, 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Prologue, 44.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, LVI, 27-28.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, XXXVII, 15.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, LIV, 18.

## AN APOLOGY FOR THE LIFE OF MRS. SHAMELA ANDREWS, 1741

In his *Samuel Richardson* (Eng. Men of Letters, 1902) Mr. Austin Dobson discusses the authorship of the above parody on Richardson's *Pamela*, but does not decide the question for us. The evidence that he brings forward seems to support Miss Thomson's conjecture (*Samuel Richardson*, London, 1900, p. 38) that it is not improbable that Henry Fielding wrote this pamphlet. In a recent examination of a copy in the possession of the Yale Library, I have found further evidence to support such a conjecture; and I am now tempted to state positively that *Shamela* is the work of Fielding.

There is in Fielding's prose a peculiarity of word-usage that affords a mechanical test for his style, and this is his almost invariable use of *hath*, *doth*, *whilst*, *durst*, etc., in place of the *has*, *does*, etc., which his contemporaries generally used. I have already examined the prose of a great number of his fellow writers and have found only two men who employ *hath*, *doth*, etc.—William Mason, the poet, and Joshua Brogden, Fielding's clerk. Consequently, when I find this usage in a work that on other grounds is possibly Fielding's, I feel that there is a presumption strongly in favor of his having written it. Such a test is applicable to *Shamela*, and when it is applied, it reveals an almost invariable use of *hath*, *doth*, and *whilst*. There are several exceptions—in three cases *has* is found, but in each instance the text is quoted from a contemporary. These would, consequently, seem to prove the rule; and on the basis of this evidence (Mason was too young at the time and Brogden too limited in his ability to have written the pamphlet) I feel that I have good grounds for a presumption that this parody is the work of Fielding.

Further new evidence is not lacking. Compare these passages:

*Shamela*, p. 55:

"Vice exposed in nauseous and odious Colours."

*Covent-Garden Journal*, No. 20:

"Vice in its proper odious Colours."

*Shamela*, p. 55:

"As to the Character of Parson *Williams*, I am sorry it is a true one. Indeed those who do not know him, will hardly believe it so; but what Scandal doth it throw on the Order to have one bad Member, unless they endeavour to screen and protect him?"

*Champion*, March 29, 1740:

"... I have already [in the issue of March 6th] condemned the custom of throwing scandal on a whole profession for the vices of some particular members." ... "But there is an error directly opposite to this ... I mean that protection which some persons would draw from their professions ..." (Henley Edition, xv, 261).

*Shamela*, p. 5:

"As for Honour to the Clergy, I am sorry to see them so solicitous about it; for if worldly Honour be meant, it is what their Predecessors in the pure and primitive Age, never had or sought. Indeed the secure Satisfaction of a good Conscience, the Approbation of the Wise and Good, . . . and the extatick Pleasure of contemplating, that their Ways are acceptable to the Great Creator of the Universe, will always attend those, who really deserve these Blessings: But for worldly Honours, they are often the Purchase of Force and Fraud, we sometimes see them in an eminent Degree possessed by Men, who are notorious for Luxury, Pride, Cruelty, Treachery . . ."

*Champion*, March 29, 1740:

"But here I would not be understood to mean [with reference to honouring the clergy] what we vulgarly call honour and dignity in a worldly sense, such as pomp or pride, or flattery, or any of this kind, to which indeed nothing can be so opposite, as will appear from examining into the qualities which are laid down as absolutely necessary to form this character, and indeed must be understood so, as they are no other than the copies of their great Master's." (Henley Edition, xv, 264.)

Certainly there is a parallelism here that strengthens my presumption; but in view of all the evidence at hand, the most that I can say is that it is very probable that this pamphlet is the work of Fielding.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

#### NOTES ON GÖTTINGEN AND THE *Harzreise*

Among the contemporaneous sources of information concerning student life at Göttingen during the first quarter of the last century *Der Göttinger Student*<sup>1</sup> seems hitherto to have escaped notice. With naïve but intense enthusiasm the author pictures the student life of his day, remembering always his rôle as advisor to the prospective *Fuchs*. The result is a fairly clear picture of the Göttingen to which Heine came only seven years later and which he describes with such vitriolic pen in the *Harzreise*. The comparison of the

<sup>1</sup> *Der Göttinger Student oder Bemerkungen, Rathschläge und Belehrungen über Göttingen und das Studenten-Leben auf der Georgia Augusta. mit acht Kupfertafeln. Göttingen im Vandenhoeck und Ruprechtschen Verlage, 1813. Allen angehenden Söhnen der hehren Georgia Augusta vorzugsweise gewidmet von einem abgehenden Zögling und heissem Verehrer der Musen.* A copy of this work came into the hands of the writer as a gift from Dr. F. Hempel of Göttingen, great-grandson of the Hempel therein mentioned as Professor of Anatomy (p. 23). Copies are in existence at the libraries of Columbia University (Teachers' College) and Harvard University.

two works is rendered doubly interesting by the wide difference in point of view between the authors.

In the following I have cited a word or passage from the *Harzreise*, appending material from *Der Göttinger Student* in illustration or explanation. The figures in parentheses refer to the *Student*—those in brackets indicate page and line in Elster's edition of Heine, vol. 3.

*Lüder* [15, 7] This disputed name in the *Harzreise* may perhaps refer to the Lüder mentioned in the following paragraph, or it is quite within the range of possibility that Heine had a dog named after the professor in question: "Die Universität besitzt im Ganzen jetzt 40 Professoren, nemlich 34 ordentliche und 6 ausserordentliche. Die theologische Facultät nimmt davon vier; die juristische sechs; die medicinische neun; und die philosophische ein und zwanzig. Planck, Stäudlin; Waldeck, Hugo, Meister; Crell, Blumenbach, Ossianer, Himly, Langenbeck; Eichhorn, Heeren, Gauss, Reuss, Mayer, Schulze, Lüder, Hausmann;—diess sind etwa die Namen der berühmtesten und bekanntesten Männer, obgleich fast alle übrigen ihre Posten auch mit Ruhm bekleiden" (p. 37).

*ein ungebundenes Exemplar* [16, 7] Various descriptions in the *Student* fail to bear out Heine's implication here and in the accompanying paragraph regarding the roughness of student life in Göttingen:

"Abgesehen von diesen zeitlichen Störungen herrscht gewiss in Göttingen ein grosser Fleiss, ein guter Ton, ein gesittetes Betragen unter den Studenten; wenigstens im Vergleich mit vielen anderen Universitäten ist alles drey in hohem Grade vorhanden. Junge Leute, die bloss studiren, um Studenten zu seyn, gibts in der That wenige; sie werden auch nicht geduldet. Sogenannte Renommisten kennt man fast nur der Beschreibung nach, oder aus dem Anblick durchreisender oder ankommender junger Leute jener Art von anderen Universitäten; denn diejenigen, welche man in Göttingen für Renommisten hält, spielen anderer Orten nur eine mittelmässige Rolle, und können sich mit Jenen nicht messen. Man klagt vielfältig, dass der feine Ton der Vorzeit jetzt nicht mehr unter den Studenten zu finden sey, indem die Ankömmlinge anderer Universitäten rohe Sitten mitgebracht hätten. Ich halte diess einigermaßen für ungegründet, erstens: weil die alten Leute so gern von schlechteren Zeiten, verdorbenen Sitten u. s. w. reden, und zweytens, weil das Schlechtere so leicht angenommen wird, dass man in Göttingen darin schon weit mehr vorgerückt seyn müsste. Dagegen scheint mir der gute Ton in Göttingen so fest eingewurzelt zu seyn, dass er selbst auf die Ankömmlinge anderer Universitäten vorthellhaft wirkt; denn kaum haben diese die Göttinger Lebensweise kennen gelernt, und sie bequemen sich schon nach derselben, legen die mitgebrachten Manieren ab und sind nach kurzer Zeit nicht von den älteren hiesigen Studirenden zu unterscheiden" (pp. 44-45).

*Pfeifenquäste* [16, 11] This would seem to indicate that smoking pipes on the street was common in Heine's day. It is quite possible that the return of students from the war brought a rougher tone into student life in general before Heine became a student at Göttingen. At any rate the *Student* in his chapter "Von den Rechten und Pflichten der Studenten" tells again a different story: "Das Rauchen auf der Strasse und dem Wall, die Jagd in den Stadtrevieren, die Ausübung der medicinischen und chirurgischen Praxis ist den Studenten verboten" (pp. 103-4). In some semi-public places however this prohibition seems not to have been enforced: "Das deutsche Haus. Hier pflegt jedoch nur Sonntags Abends Gesellschaft zu seyn, vorzüglich Tanzlustige beyderlei Geschlechts. Der Tanzsaal ist zwar gross und schön, allein er pflegt bald durch die Ausdünstungen und den Staub mit einer üblen Atmosphäre angefüllt zu seyn. Die Schönen sind aus der Classe der Wäscherinnen, Dienstmägde und Handwerkstöchter zusammen gesetzt; der Bursch geht deshalb auch, wenn er nicht tanzt, mit brennender Pfeife und bedecktem Kopfe auf dem Saale herum" (p. 123).

*Schäfer* [18, 18] The *Student* confirms Vos's conjecture that Schäfer was actually the name of the *Pedell*: "Wohnung. Wer die Auswahl eines Zimmers nicht bis zu seiner persönlichen Ueberkunft aufschieben will, auch keine studirende Freunde hat, welche dieselbe für ihn treffen können, der kann sich an den Logis-Commissair wenden; jetzt ist diess der Ober-Pedell Schäfer, ein sehr gefälliger prompter Mann, der die Aufträge gewissenhaft besorgt. Man muss ihm den Preis schreiben, und kann auch sonstige Wünsche hinzufügen" (pp. 85-86).

*Gottschalks Taschenbuch für Harzreisende* [23, 23-24] This was evidently the standard guide-book of the time and is so recognized by the *Student*. That the practice, common among students at Göttingen, of undertaking tours into the Harz received official encouragement, is indicated by the following:

"Der Harz. Wer in Göttingen studirte und nicht etwa aus der Nähe des Harzes herkommt, muss sich schämen, wenn er diese merkwürdigen norddeutschen Gebirge nicht besucht hat, da er ihnen doch so nahe war! Vorzüglich in den Pfingstferien pflegen sich Gesellschaften von Studenten zu vereinigen, oft 12 bis 20 Mann stark, und treten mit einem kleinen Tornister, worin etwas reine Wäsche, mit einer Pfeife, einer Schnabsflasche, in leichter Kleidung zu Fuss die Reise an. Der Herr Professor Hausmann pflegt jeden Sommer öffentlich eine belehrende Vorlesung für die Harzreisenden zu halten; wer diese nicht hören konnte, muss sich aus Gottschalks Werk über den Harz belehren. Binnen 8 Tagen pflegen die Reisenden zwar ermüdet, aber an Kenntnissen bereichert, an Körper und Geist gestärkt, zurückzukehren. Man bestimmt die Reisekosten gewöhnlich auf 3 Louisd'or" (pp. 130-131).

The *Göttinger Student* was finished in September, 1813, as is shown by the date of the introduction. A month later the decisive battle at Leipzig took place, and the six years which followed marked the rise and suppression of that outburst of youthful patriotism which manifested itself in the formation of the first *Allgemeine Deutsche Burschenschaft*. The few years which lie between the *Student* and Heine's Göttingen were filled with events which may well have changed the whole tenor of student life—a fact which may help to account for certain discrepancies between the two.

P. R. KOLBE.

*Municipal University of Akron.*

#### BUT ME NO BUTS

The following additions to Mr. A. C. Potter's list in the *Modern Language Notes*, xxx, 160, may be cited:

- "Tinkers (quod you), tinke me no tinkes." [*Common Conditions*.]
- "Hang me no hangings." [*Horestes*, 371.]
- "Founder me no founderings." [*Respublica*, 50.]
- "Typhon me no Typhons." [Kyd, ed. Boas, p. 173.]
- "Force him no forces." [Nashe, ed. McKerrow, III, p. 99.]
- "Cucke me no cuckes." [Chapman, *An Humorous Dayes Mirth*.]
- "Planet me no planets." [*The Rebellion*, Hazlitt's Dodsley, XIV, p. 75.]
- "Parish me no parishes." [Peele, ed. Dyce, p. 29.]
- "Crown me no crowns." [*Lingua*, II, i.]
- "Cause me no causes." [Massinger, *A New Way* . . . I, iii.]
- "Virgin me no virgins." [*Ibid.*, III, ii.]
- "End me no ends." [*Ibid.*, v, i.]
- "Private me no privates." [Th. Heywood, *The English Travelier*.]
- "Lady me no ladies." [Shadwell, *Teague o' Divilly*.]
- "Dresse me no dressings." [*Late Lancashire Witches*.]
- "Boot me no boots." [Tatham, *The Rump*, I, i.]
- "Good me no goods." [Wilson, *The Cheats*, II, iii.]
- "Conscience me no conscience." [*Ibid.*, III, v.]
- "Flame me no flame." [Shirley, *The Court Secret*, I, i.]
- "Grace me no graces." [Yarrington, *Two Murders* . . . , III, ii.]
- "Star me no stars." [Day, *Humour out of Breath*, I, iii.]
- "Signet me no signets." [*Ibid.*, IV, iii.]
- "Hold me no holds." [Day, *Blind Beggar* . . . , II, ii.]
- "Suspect me no suspects." [*Ibid.*]
- "Pray me no praying." [Cokain, *Trappolin Creduto Principe*, III, i.]
- "Kind me no kind." [S. Rowlands, *Greene's Ghost*, p. 29.]
- "Alter me no alters." [*Club Law*, v, iii.]
- "Fish me no fishing." [Phineas Fletcher, *Sicelides*, III, iv.]
- "Nyk me not with nay." [Towneley Plays, p. 323, l. 571.]
- "Al nykked hym wyth nay." [*Gawain and the Green Knight*, l. 706.]
- "No wold thai nick him with no nay." [*Amis and Amiloun*, l. 2176.]

Browning has:

- "nuptial me no nuptials." [Cambridge ed., p. 956.]

For "plat me no platforms" my references are lacking.

*Armour Institute of Technology.*

C. B. COOPER.

CHAUCER'S *fraknes*

In my recent paper, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight" (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* XX, 161-240), I ventured to suggest (p. 167) that the *fraknes* of K. T. 1311 might be a euphemism for pock-marks. A confirmation of this suggestion, tho from documents of a later period, may be observed in the citations of *Pock-frecken*, *Pock-freckled*, *New Eng. Dic.* (under *Pock*): "1530 PALSGR. 256/1 Poke frekyns, *picquetevre* or *picquottevre de uerolle*. 1695 *Lond. Gaz.* No. 3134/4 Mary Scarlet, . . . thin visage, swarthy complexion, pock frecken. 1714 *Ibid.* No. 5223/4 A spare middle-siz'd Man, Pockfreckled and Ruddy Complexion."

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

## A DIALOGUE BY BOILEAU

I came recently on the following entry, under date of February, 1684, and under the classification "Miscellanies," in the "Catalogue of Books Printed and Published at London, in Hillary Term (1683/84)," contained in Arber's reprint of *The Term Catalogues*, (II, 62): "The Infernal Observator, or the Quickening Dead. In a dialogue written lately in French by Mr. Boileau, and now made English. Octavo. Sold by B. Tooke at the Ship in St. Paul's Churchyard; W. Davis in Amen Corner; and Mr. Beaulieu in Duke's Court, against St. Martin's Church." Whether this book is extant or not I do not know; I have not been able to trace it. But can anyone throw any light on the "dialogue written lately in French by Mr. Boileau"? If "Mr. Boileau" is the author of the *Art Poétique*, the dialogue may be one of three things,—a work that has not come down to us, or the *Fragment d'un Dialogue contre les Modernes qui font des vers latins*, or the *Dialogue des Morts* (the name given to the pirated editions of the work known in its authoritative form as *Les Héros de Roman*). Boileau had composed both of these prior to 1674, but it does not appear that anyone except Brossette had any knowledge of the *Fragment*; Boileau did not even write it down;<sup>1</sup> besides, the title of the English translation does not correspond with the subject-matter of the *Fragment*. As to the *Dialogue des Morts*, he composed it in 1664-65, and recited it to friends; but, as far as I know, it has always been accepted by scholars that its first (unauthorized) appearance in print was in the second volume of the collection known as *Le Retour des Pièces Choiesies, ou Bigarrures Curieuses*, published at Emmerich

<sup>1</sup> See Gidel's ed. of Boileau, III, 235, note.

in Rhenish Prussia in 1688.<sup>2</sup> Does the entry in *The Term Catalogues* suggest that there was an earlier pirated edition of this dialogue in French, unknown to scholars? Or can sufficient emphasis be placed on the word "written" in the phrase "a dialogue written lately in French" to justify the belief that this English translation was made from the French manuscript of someone who heard Boileau recite the piece and copied it down? Our only alternative is to believe that there was another Boileau, contemporary with the great one (and well enough known to the English public to need no distinguishing Christian name), who wrote at almost the same time a dialogue of which the subject-matter and title must have been singularly like those of Despréaux's work (in order to justify the title of the English translation). It would be rather piquant if Boileau's work had first attained the dignity of type in the English language.

A. F. BRUCE CLARK.

University College, Toronto.

---

#### BRIEF MENTION

*Chaucer and his Poetry.* Lectures delivered in 1914 on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation in the Johns Hopkins University, by George Lyman Kittredge (Cambridge, at the Harvard University Press, 1915). The Turnbull Lectures on *Chaucer and his Poetry* are more than a notable *fait accompli*; they are also an omen. And it is the significance of Professor Kittredge's book rather than primarily the book itself with which this note is concerned.

The development of Chaucerian scholarship within the last three or four decades has been a peculiarly interesting one. For it has represented a succession of preoccupations, now with this, now with that relatively circumscribed area within the larger confines of a wide and varied field. The conquest of the kingdom, like the winning of pre-Chaucerian England itself, has come through the slow reduction of shire after shire. The emphasis in the earlier days was, as it had to be, upon problems of language and text—the indispensable foundation for any further study whatsoever. Then gradually the stress was shifted to the active quest of sources, and that in turn yielded first place to the minute scrutiny of problems of chronology. To the short-sighted observer (and there has been no speech or language where their voice has not been heard) Chaucerian scholarship seemed to be engrossed with problems—whether of language, text, sources, or chronology—fascinating in themselves, but alien to the supreme end of literary investigation, the interpre-

<sup>2</sup> See Crane's ed. of the *Héros de Roman*, Boston, 1902, p. 37.

tation and illumination of a great writer's *art*. The objectors have been, of course, both right and wrong. The ultimate end of Chaucerian investigation is the "appreciation" of Chaucer. But such an appreciation, to be valid or adequate, must rest upon a synthesis of the bewilderingly manifold and complex elements that enter into his life and art. Towards that synthesis all the seeming absorption in problems has been steadily tending—sometimes unconsciously, oftener with full recognition of its goal. And of late there have been abundant signs, not that the need for analysis was past, but that the time for at least a preliminary synthesis was ripe. And in the book before us the intensely special and critical scholarship of the past decades has justified itself by its result—a vital and luminous and comprehensive interpretation of Chaucer and his art.

The significance of the book, then, lies in the fact that such an interpretation, alive to its finger-tips, is what it is, not in spite of, but by reason of its saturation with the results of all the minute and special scholarship that has been lavished upon Chaucer for years past. None of this shows. The foundations are where they belong—underground; the builder's paraphernalia are back in the workshop; the scaffolding is gone. To the uninitiated reader the book is a series of delightful and illuminating *causeries*. Yet behind a lightness of touch that completely conceals the erudition, and a humor as pervasive and a vernacular as racy as Chaucer's own, stretch the so-called arid deserts of research. There are paragraphs by the dozen that mask successfully a whole battery of volumes, and an innocent-seeming sentence urbanely harbours you a brace of dissertations. The scannell pipes of research under Mr. Kittredge's fingers discourse most eloquent music. And the signal distinction of the lectures is precisely their transmutation of the results of rigidly technical investigation into the fine flower of critical interpretation. The hour had come for such a synthesis, and the volume marks, it may be hoped, the initiation of a new stage in the progress of Chaucerian scholarship.

The plan and in large measure the treatment of the book are determined by the fact that it is a series of lectures. It makes no pretense to completeness—although it achieves the effect of completeness more nearly than many an exhaustive treatise. Professor Kittredge assumes four stages of Chaucer's poetical activity—the long recognized French, Italian, and "English" periods, and between the first and second a Period of Transition. From each of these four periods a single work is chosen as typical. The French period is represented by the *Book of the Duchess*; the Period of Transition, by the *House of Fame*; the Italian period, by the *Troilus*; and the final period, by the *Canterbury Tales*. To the *Canterbury Tales* two lectures are devoted; to each of the other poems, one; and a preliminary lecture—a vivid presentment of the modernness of the Middle Ages and the Chaucerianness of Chaucer—deals with "The Man and his Times." Throughout the discussions Mr.

Kittredge brings forth out of his treasure things new and old. Some important contributions—such as the demonstration of the existence of a Period of Transition, and the recognition of the Marriage Group among the *Canterbury Tales*—with which students of Chaucer are familiar in the lecturer's more technical writings, reappear here in a new perspective. And there are fresh contributions as well—notably the illuminating conception of "the Dreamer" in the *Book of the Duchess*, and the analysis of the characters of Troilus, Pandarus, and especially Cressida, in the *Troilus*. But the highest value of the book, be it said again, is not in this or that specific addition which it makes to the sum of our information about Chaucer. It is in its illumination of the whole field by an unsurpassed knowledge of the period, turned to account by a critical faculty which is here essentially creative. What it offers to the larger reading public needs no comment. But it is a question whether it will not exercise an even more powerful influence through its use as an indispensable companion to every College or University course in Chaucer.

J. L. L.

---

*The Assumption of the Virgin: a Miracle Play from the N-Town Cycle.* Edited by W. W. Greg (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1915. 8vo., 75 pages). It is to be noticed at once that this monograph is issued as the first number of promised "Studies in the Religious Drama." The next three numbers of this series, "in preparation," are in advance entitled: "II. The Chester Antichrist Play: parallel texts of the Peniarth and Devonshire mss.; III. The Doctors Play: parallel texts from the York, Wakefield, Coventry, and Chester Cycles; IV. An Essay towards the History of the N-Town Cycle." This is an attractive group of timely subjects, giving further indication of fresh impulses in the study of the Cyclic Plays, by which former conclusions are being revised and new problems set. Such contributions as "The Liturgical Basis of the Towneley Mysteries" (*Pub. M. L. A. of A.*, xxiv, 419 f.), by F. W. Cady, and "The Relation of the English Corpus Christi Play to the Middle English Religious Lyric" (*Modern Philology*, v, 1 f.), by George C. Taylor, are sufficiently illustrative of what may be gained by suggesting new points of view, and by encouraging a suspension of judgment on the final inquiry of how the cycles are related to each other. As shown by his announcement, Mr. Greg is investigating the "History of the N-Town Cycle," for which preliminary studies must be undertaken. He will, therefore, welcome Mr. John K. Bonnell's admirable observations on "The Source in Art of the so-called *Prophets Play* in the Hegge Collection" (*Pub. M. L. A. of A.*, xxix, 327 f.), and he will take minute account of the comprehensive investigation of Miss Esther L. Swenson, "An Inquiry into the Composition and Structure of the *Ludus Coventriae*. With

a Note on the Home of the Ludus Coventriae by Hardin Craig." (Minneapolis, Bulletin of the University of Minnesota, 1914). In the first instalment of his "Studies," which is now published, Mr. Greg deals in a new way with the problem of the forty-first play, *The Assumption of the Virgin*. The text of the play is reproduced from the MS. "as exactly as possible," and "matters of interpretation" are brought together in a chapter of critical notes. The MS. is further represented by two facsimile pages, to show that the hand of the Assumption play differs from that of the main portion of the cycle. Turning now to Mr. Greg's Introduction, he is found to urge the conviction that the scribe of the inserted play was contemporary with the main scribe, the entire MS. being rubricated at one time and by one person. The dialect is minutely examined on the basis of Max Kramer's dissertation (1892), with the result that "whatever conclusions the phonetic evidence may justify as to the cycle as a whole, will be equally valid for the Assumption play in particular." What is strikingly new in Mr. Greg's study relates to the meter of the play, which the rubricator has curiously distinguished by the use of an additional symbol, a small paragraph, at the head of lines that do not belong to the regular stanzas, but are inserted between them. These interstanzaic lines are designated intercalary, and their origin, metrical relation, and organic purpose give exercise to Mr. Greg's skill in conjecture. The play is thus discovered to be marked off by a prosodic feature that is believed to be unique. Mr. Greg's presentation of the matter will attract the eager attention of the prosodist. Finally, Mr. Greg will be thanked for supplying the text of the *De Assumptione* from the *Legenda Aurea*.

J. W. B.

---

Professor Malcolm William Wallace, of University College, Toronto, has published *The Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge University Press; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915) which, it is safe to say, will take its place as the standard authority on the subject. The writer has gone to the original sources of information, and he has shown excellent critical judgment in the manner in which he has used his materials. The merits of the work are on the biographical side. In this connection, *inter alia*, the author discusses very fully and satisfactorily the problem of *Astrophel and Stella*—the sincerity of Sidney's passion for Stella, the history of their relations to one another, and the bearing of the sonnets on the different phases of these relations. On the other hand, the number of pages devoted to the criticism of Sidney's works from the purely literary point of view is not very great. The discovery of new biographical materials was hardly to be expected. Professor Wallace, however, has been able to add some new data to our pre-

vious knowledge of Sidney's life. He has unearthed an account-book of the poet's school-days at Shrewsbury, which sheds some light on his boyhood. He has also shown how at one time the project of a marriage between Sidney and a sister of William of Orange was seriously entertained. In the main, however, he has had to rely upon the old sources of information, and accordingly, the general outlines of Sidney's character, which is admirably summed up in the Postscript to this volume, remain the same as before. The image of Sidney—the "world's wonder," "that rare more-than-man"—as it appeared to his contemporaries, is now irrecoverable, and doubtless would be so, even if the materials for his biography were more abundant than they are. The present faithful record of his career, which was at once so brilliant and so tragic, brings us, however, nearer to a comprehension of the man than any previous biography.

J. D. B.

---

Dr. Carl A. Krause has recently published in book form four lectures given at the University of Marburg in the summer of 1914 (*Über die Reformmethode in Amerika*. With Preface by Dr. Max Walter, Director of the *Musterschule*, Frankfurt a. M. Marburg, Elwert, 1914. 67 pp.). The four chapters of the book deal with the following topics: (I) A brief outline of the American educational system. Growth and development of the Reform Method. Definition of this method and its application to American conditions. Mode of procedure and presentation of subject in its initial stages, with special emphasis on German phonology. (II) Grammar. Inductive *versus* deductive teaching of grammatical principles. The pedagogical advantages of the Reform Method as evidenced and demonstrated by practical results. (III) Regents' Examinations and Course of Study. A brief outline of what is being demanded by the Board of Regents in the semester examinations in German, and a detailed description of the four-year course in German. (IV) America's contribution to the methodological literature of modern foreign-language teaching from 1875 to 1913. The book offers a concise and skilful exposition of the fundamental principles of the Reform Method (better known as the Direct Method) as applied to actual school-room problems. Being the outgrowth of the author's own practice in one of the high schools of the City of New York, it will not fail to arouse the interest of every progressive teacher of German in our secondary schools, especially since Dr. Krause is known to be one of the most energetic champions of the Direct Method in this country. A sequel to the above is Dr. Krause's "Literature of Modern Language Methodology in America for 1914," *Monatshefte f. deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik*, Vol. xvi, No. 8.

C. M. P.



## Increased Trade Opportunities in South America

have led in many places to the introduction of Spanish as a study of commercial importance in the schools. Wherever

### Coester's Spanish Grammar

is adopted for the beginning text, the ability to read connected Spanish, and to write an intelligible Spanish letter, is gained unusually early in the course. This is an invaluable feature for those classes where time-saving, at no expense of thoroughness, is a distinct factor in the preparation for future commercial intercourse with Spanish-speaking peoples. \$1.25

*Write for our list of other practical texts for  
Spanish classes.*

**GINN AND COMPANY**

70 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK



### RECENT COLLEGE TEXTS

**THE CHIEF BRITISH POETS OF THE  
FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH  
CENTURIES.** Edited by W. A. Neil-  
son and K. G. T. Webster.

A comprehensive collection of the best nar-  
rative, satirical and lyric poems of the later  
middle ages. In *The Chief Poets Series*, \$2.50.  
Postpaid.

**CHIEF EUROPEAN DRAMATISTS.**

Selected and Edited by Brander Mat-  
thews.

Twenty-one complete plays (in English) by  
the master dramatists of Greece, Rome, Spain,  
Italy, France, Germany, and Scandinavia. \$2.75.  
Postpaid.

**SHAKESPEARE QUESTIONS: An Out-  
line for the Study of Shakespeare's  
Leading Plays.** By Professor Odell  
Shepard.

Eighteen plays are taken up. While primarily  
designed for college use the book will be helpful  
to all students of Shakespeare. *Riverside Litera-  
ture Series No. 246. Library Binding 50 cents.*  
Postpaid.

**HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO.**

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

### POEMA DE FERNAN GONÇALEZ

Nueva edición, con introducción, notas y glosario.

Por C. CARROLL MARDEN

282 pages. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.50 net; Paper, \$2.00

The critical text of this old Spanish poem is  
based on the extant manuscripts and the early  
prose chronicles. In point of historical import-  
ance Fernan Gonçalez ranks with the Cid. The  
heroic character of this poem composed in his  
honor, the inherent interest of the subject matter,  
the many early legends which it sets forth, the  
fact that it is one of the very few extant speci-  
mens of early epic poetry—these considerations  
make the *Poema de Fernan Gonçalez* one of the  
most important monuments of Spanish literature.

### STUDIES IN HONOR OF A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT

Two volumes, 8vo. 450 and 334 pages. Price  
\$7.50 including postage.

Volume I contains fifteen studies in Old and  
Modern French language and literature. Volume  
II, containing seven studies, is devoted to Spanish  
and Italian. The volumes may be purchased  
separately (\$4.25 postpaid).

A limited number of copies of the photogravure  
of Professor Elliott which forms the frontispiece  
may be had. Price fifty cents.

**THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS**

Baltimore, Maryland

## Heath's Modern Language Series

### NEW FRENCH PUBLICATIONS

#### Knowles and Favard's Grammaire de la Conversation

\$1.15

By MARY H. KNOWLES and BERTHE DES COMBES FAVARD, Instructor in French, Hyde Park High School, Chicago. Cloth. clxiii + 171 pages.

A direct conversational method, entirely in French, for the acquiring of pure, rhythmic, idiomatic French by means of oral and written drill. A carefully graduated system of questions and suggested answers, dealing with topics of real conversation, obliges pupils to speak French from the first and introduces them gradually to the essentials of French grammar. The latter, in logical arrangement and with rules well illustrated, follows the lessons.

#### French Verse of the XVI Century

70 cents

Selected and edited with introduction and notes by C. H. C. WRIGHT, Professor of the French Language and Literature, Harvard University. Cloth. ix + 125 pages.

Selections from Clément Marot, Melin de Saint-Gelais, Charles Fontaine, Louise Labé, Pierre de Ronsard, Joachim du Bellay, Jean-Antoine de Baif, Remy Belleau, Olivier de Magny, Jean Passerat, Mesdames des Roches, Agrippa d'Aubigné, Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, Philippe Desportes.

---

### D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

LONDON

---

### JUST PUBLISHT

## Prokosch and Purin's Konversations- und Lesebuch

By EDUARD PROKOSCH, Professor in the University of Texas, and C. M. PURIN, Assistant Professor in the University of Wisconsin. iv + 187 pp. 12mo. 90 cents.

An interesting collection for second-year work in conversation which is based on the theory of the direct method that the first acquisition of an active vocabulary must proceed from object teaching, its increase from reading. This two-fold approach to the spoken language is combined with information as to Germany and the Germans.

The book is entirely in German, and each reading selection is followed by three sections devoted respectively to *Fragen*, *Grammatik*, and *Wortkunde und Übungen*.



### HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

34 West 33d Street  
NEW YORK

6 Park Street  
BOSTON

623 So. Wabash Ave.  
CHICAGO